



THE  
Nonconformist Conscience  
a Persecuting Force.

BY

JAS. A. NEWBOLD, B.A.,

*Sometime member of the Manchester School Board, author of  
"Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, M.A., and Wesleyan Methodist  
Educational Policy," "The Overstrain in Primary  
Schools," &c.*



"Many times men walk according to conscience when they  
are walking quite contrary to Scripture." – ARCHBISHOP LEIGHTON.

"A man may be acting from such conscience as he has,  
and yet his policy may outrage every principle of justice."—  
REV. J. HIRST HOLLOWELL.



JOHN HEYWOOD LTD.,  
DEANSGATE AND RIDGEFIELD, MANCHESTER ;  
20, 22, 24, 26, LAMB'S CONDUIT ST., LONDON, W.C



# CONTENTS.


---

	PAGE.
Introduction—Scope of Work .....	5
<b>The Anti-brewer Agitation over the Question of the Manchester</b>	
<b>Mayoralty considered as an object-lesson in Nonconformist</b>	
Intolerance.....	6
Who is to Blame for Drunkenness ? .....	14
The True Responsibility of the Publican .....	18
The Argument from a "Rising Ethical Standard" Examined .....	30
The Puritanic Theory .....	34
Its Failure in Practice .....	37
The Agitation Tested by Christian Standards .....	41
Rev. F. B. Meyer's "bandit" Speech .....	46
Want of Christian Spirit.....	49
Rev. C. F. Aked as a Champion of "Righteousness" .....	55
What the Agitation Implies .....	62
The Psychological Snare of Teetotalism .....	66
The Logical Confusion of Teetotalism .....	68
Mr. Lloyd-George and the United Kingdom Alliance Meeting .....	78
Other Teetotalisms Abandoned .....	81
Passive Resisters .....	86
Two Persecuting Movements ..	94
Persecuting Utterances of Certain Passive Resisters .....	96
Dr. Leach .....	99
Dr. John Massie.....	101
Rev. J. Hirst Hollowell .....	104
Dr. John Clifford ... ..	108
Passive Resistance a Geographical Matter.....	123
Cry of "No Tests for Teachers" .....	124
The Nemesis of History .....	131

	PAGE.
Cowper-Templeism not likely to endure as exclusive system .....	134
"Secular Solution" not fair to all .....	136
If Secular Education comes, whose the Blame? .....	140
The National Free Church Council .....	149
Is the Influence of the Free Church Council narrowing Wesleyan Methodism? .....	180
The Government Education Bill (1908).....	195
The Government Licensing Bill (1908) .....	206
Some Band of Hope Methods—Sweets and Bitters.....	212
"Storming the Chancellor"—a Free Church Council Deputation..	215
Open letters to—	
The Right Reverend the Bishop of Manchester .....	219
The Rev. Canon E. L. Hicks, M.A.....	225
The Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., President Designate of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference.....	231
The Rev. Dr. James Hope Moulton, of Didsbury College .....	235
R. D. Darbshire, Esq., Honorary Freeman of the City of Manchester.....	239
Mr. J. W. Graham, M.A., Principal of Dalton Hall.....	242
Mr. E. Vipont Brown, M.D. (Lond.) .....	246
Trial in the "Court of Honour" .....	250

## INTRODUCTION.

---

N the following pages the anti-brewer agitation which raged in Manchester during the autumn of 1907 is taken as the starting-point of the discussion. That movement is treated as an object-lesson in intolerance, and the association of the leaders with other persecuting influences is pointed out. Passive resistance in particular is examined, and a persecuting element is shown to be present, both in its fundamental principle and in the tone and spirit of leading passive resisters themselves. As the Free Church Council is one of the principal organs of the Nonconformist conscience, the composition and action of that body naturally come under review. Parties and persons are frequently dealt with, but rather as the embodiment and exemplification of principles than in their narrower aspects.

This little work is of the nature of a protest and a challenge. It is put forth in the interests of fairness and moderation, by one who can at least claim the credit of being perfectly disinterested in the matter—for the writer has received no impulse or help of any kind in the production of these pages. Such as it is, the work is his own. Fundamentally, it is the appeal of an individual conscience addressed to the public conscience as a protest against the standards of the Nonconformist conscience. The attempt has been made throughout to bring everything to the test of civic justice and civic utility.

## CHAPTER I.

---

### THE PRINCIPLES INVOLVED.

---

### THE MAYORALTY DISPUTE IN MANCHESTER.

---

#### OUTLINE OF FACTS.

IN August, 1907, the Manchester City Council gave some indication of its wish that Alderman Edward Holt should be appointed Lord Mayor in the following November. That gentleman had rendered good service in the Council for seventeen years. Five times he had been re-elected councillor without opposition, and the vote by which he was advanced to the Aldermanic bench was unanimous. But the proposal to confer on him the Mayoralty of the City was the signal for opposition of a somewhat strenuous character on the part of men who claimed to be the leaders of religion and philanthropy in Manchester and the neighbourhood. Their consciences, they said, were hurt by the proposal to confer the highest civic dignity on a brewer and owner of tied houses.

The November elections proved disastrous to the protesting party. Some of their friends were defeated at the polls, and supporters of Mr. Holt won certain seats; with the result that the objecting minority within the Council was reduced from about one-fourth of the total membership to less than one-eighth. Nothing daunted, however, by this repulse, Canon Hicks and Councillor Johnston declare that it is only the first battle in the

campaign which has been lost. The struggle, we are told, has not ended, but only just begun.

As the battle is to be fought over again in the near future, it seems worth while to study the question in a more dispassionate spirit than was possible in the heat and excitement of the recent struggle. Such study will not be entirely wasted, for few local movements in recent times have presented to the observer so many varied features of interest.

### A PRELIMINARY GLANCE.

Let us, before advancing to the main argument, pass briefly in review some of the more important aspects of the question.

1.—Viewed in relation to the liberty of the subject, the agitators aim at setting up a new trade disability. They propose to narrow the bounds of civic freedom, and rob a class of a part of the rights its members now enjoy. We are plainly told that the present proposal is only a beginning, and that, if successful in this their first effort, other classes will be subjected by them to the like inquisition and condemnation. Hence the matter interests all thoughtful citizens. If the new principle of persecution is to be accepted, let it only be accepted after full consideration, and with a just appreciation of its scope and import. It is a matter of vital interest to all classes that no one class should be subjected to persecution. As we are all members of one great society, the proposal to depress and degrade any portion of the social organism is essentially anti-social in its tendency.

2.—Another novel feature is that the end of persecution is not sought to be attained by the direct means of express legal enactment, but by the indirect method of social ostracism, based on appeals to class prejudice. And these methods, so alien to the genius of Christianity, are advocated by Christian leaders in the name of the religion whose principles they contravene.

3.—The movement involves a distinct usurpation of the City Council's proper constitutional powers. That

a number of private citizens should attempt to veto the will of the majority of the town's elected representatives implies a certain impeachment of the representative system of government. Their action is in this sense anti-civic.

4.—The kinship of the agitation with the passive resistance movement, obvious from the first, was noted by several correspondents of the *Manchester Guardian*. In both movements there exists the common element of an attack on the constituted order in the name of conscience. His Honour Judge Parry, in an address to the Labour Party at Urmston, drew attention to the anarchic tendency of both agitations, and condemned those who participated in either of them as "bad citizens." Never before in the history of Manchester did an able and respected judge affix so undesirable a badge on many hundreds of men who claim to be the leaders of religion and philanthropy in the city.

5.—This brings us to a most interesting and important feature in the discussion—the lines along which it divided public opinion. What are plain men to say when they find the Bishop of Manchester, Canon Richardson, and Judge Parry on one side in the controversy, and Dr. MacLaren, Canon Hicks, and Dr. J. H. Moulton on the other? This clash of justly honoured names should challenge us ordinary citizens to independent thought on the question. Let us look past great names to great principles; for the main elements of civic life hang together in organic connection, and our particular conclusions are never safely grounded except when based on general truths.

6.—Leaving individuals, and coming to the Churches, we find, broadly speaking, that the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches were opposed to the agitation, whilst the Free Churches were in its favour. "Quartus," writing in the *Manchester Guardian*, tells us plainly that in this matter the Free Churches are, as usual, in the right, and that the verdict of the future will be on their side. But those who, unlike "Quartus," are not sustained by the comfortable assurance of personal infallibility, will

take leave to note the essential character of the agitation. To such observers it seems a vital distinction that in their past struggle for liberty the Free Churches were striving to win freedom for themselves, whereas in this instance they are attempting, not to widen the bounds of freedom, but to narrow them. Having rid themselves of religious disabilities, they seek to erect a new trade disability against a class they dislike. Ceasing to be persecuted, they would fain become persecutors. Surely this is a vital difference, and suffices in itself to reverse the strictures of "Quartus."

7.—It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that Wesleyan Methodism has officially intervened in this apparently local question. The President of the Conference (Rev. J. S. Simon, of Didsbury), the President-Designate (Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A.), and Dr. J. H. Moulton, of Didsbury, have pronounced a decided opinion against the election of Mr. Holt; and both the Wesleyan London weeklies, the *Methodist Recorder* and the *Methodist Times*, took the same side. Mr. Simon, in a speech delivered in Manchester, disclaimed partisanship, and stated that "Wesleyans were not party politicians." We shall examine this claim later on, and will at this point merely note the fact that a Wesleyan brewer was elected Mayor of Stockport in November, 1906, and re-elected in November, 1907, without a word of protest from Mr. Simon and his Didsbury colleague, Dr. J. H. Moulton. Yet Didsbury is as near to Stockport as it is to Manchester. Most of my readers will feel, I think, that some explanation is needed, and will scarcely envy those who have to make it, especially as Dr. Moulton, in speaking of his opposition to Mr. Holt, expressly wrote: "*Had I known him to belong to my own party or my own Church I should have opposed him with equal or greater conviction.*"

8.—The entry of the Free Church Council into the controversy is also a noticeable fact. The Rev. S. E. Keeble, speaking in the Free Trade Hall, said that he spoke for four thousand members of the Free Church Federation in this district in his opposition to Mr. Holt's

election. This body is coming to the front, and has not so far received the critical attention it deserves. What is its composition? What are its credentials? For whom has it the right to speak? On what lines is it developing? What is its sphere of action? What its methods? Some attempt will be made to answer these questions at a later stage.

9.—Another interesting feature is the fact that the agitators failed from the first to carry with them the bulk of the Liberal party on the Council. "That party," they said, "had sold them in the matter." Does the Liberal party in Manchester detect the essentially illiberal character of the agitation, and is it beginning to suspect that the kindred movement of passive resistance is equally a travesty of Liberal principles? Certainly the persecuting action of the West Riding County Council, some of the Welsh Councils, and the late London County Council has done much to open the eyes of the public to the true inwardness of the passive resistance movement, and the growing disillusion has been hastened by the overbearing tone of such men as Dr. Clifford, Dr. Massie, and the Rev. J. Hirst Hollowell.

10.—If the Liberal party on the City Council declined to budge one step to please the agitators, the *Manchester Guardian* could only bring itself to go half-way with them. Beginning by mildly deprecating the controversy, that paper soon opened its columns wide to the tide of agitation, which raged and tore along in a flood that seemed all but irresistible. Correspondents of the baser sort instinctively gave prominence to the personal aspect of the question. In their hands the legend of Mr. Holt's iniquity grew visibly. Innuendo passed into direct suggestion, suggestion hardened into evidence, evidence stiffened into proof. Mr. Holt's dignified reticence under the storm of calumny was held to be the silence of conscious guilt. He, unlike some of his opponents, never forgot what was due from and to an English gentleman. When, at the proper time, Mr. Holt gave his vindication to the Council, to whom alone he owed it, the reply was crushing in its completeness. Then the *Guardian*,

remembering, if somewhat late in the day, the part a great paper should play in the amenities of civic life, choked off its clamorous correspondents. From that time began that collapse of the movement which became visible to all in the November polls. Three points emerge which concern the Manchester public. Firstly, the enormous power of the *Guardian* to make or mar an agitation. Secondly, the pitch to which an agitation may attain in the columns of that paper without a corresponding movement of public opinion outside. Thirdly, how extreme is the position assumed by Canon Hicks and his friends when the *Guardian* deserts them in the middle of the fight.

11.—One lamentable feature in the quarrel has been the extraordinary license of language and temper which the party of piety and philanthropy allowed itself. At this stage I will only name one instance. A private citizen who had been accorded the highest possible mark of the Council's esteem—the honorary freedom of the city—described Alderman Holt's occupation as the "devil's trade." His words were, "This devil's trade (is) too wicked for any civic sanction or any private justification." It argues scant respect for the Council which voted this gentleman the highest honour at its disposal that he should thus flout the Council's choice in the matter of the Mayoralty. This is the first time that an honorary freeman of the city has hurled so insulting an expression at a citizen as upright and worthy as himself. Let us hope, for the sake of public decency, that it will be the last. There is no reason why the controversial utterances of religious men should be marked by an absence of the restraints usually imposed by the feelings and habits of gentlemen.

12.—An absolutely unique feature in the agitation was the presentation of a petition purporting to be signed by 2,430 citizens, and supported by 432 consentient bodies, "representing the conviction of nearly 148,000 persons." One gasps at such stupendous figures. With Dominie Sampson, we exclaim "prodigious," and are lost in wonder. Speaking for myself, my first wonder is that those who supported the manifesto should exceed

those who signed it in the proportion of sixty to one. My second wonder is as to what proportion of the 148,000 were juveniles, incapable of pronouncing a rational opinion on the question. My third wonder is as to whether any of the adults included were counted more than once in their different capacities as members of various organisations. Sir T. P. Whittaker recently spoke of an extreme and impracticable element who were very noisy and "much in evidence in letters to the papers and resolutions from the same handful of people meeting over and over again in various capacities." My fourth wonder is that of the 2,430 citizens who signed the manifesto only a mere handful partly filled the platform at the Free Trade Hall demonstration. My fifth wonder is that out of the 148,000 sympathisers so few attended the demonstration that the building was never quite full. My sixth wonder is what the 148,000 were doing on the day of the poll. My seventh and last wonder is that in all their demonstrations against Mr. Holt's election the protesting party did not hit upon the idea of holding a public review of these 148,000 stalwarts. The serried hosts of warlike saints would have struck terror into the hearts of the majority on the City Council, and paved the way for that domination of the many by the few which becomes the true theory of representative government when our friends happen to be in the minority.

### PRESUMPTIVE EVIDENCE.

Coming to our main argument, we begin by noting the fact that the proposal to exclude a brewer from the Mayoralty implies the setting up of a new disability. This in itself constitutes a strong presumption against the proposal. Disability spells persecution, and persecution is alien to the spirit of the times. Society, now fully convinced of the iniquity and futility of religious persecution, is little likely to enter on the path of trade persecution. The whole trend of modern thought and practice is to widen, not narrow, the bounds of civic freedom, and very strong arguments indeed will be

needed to convince thoughtful men that it is either wise or just to reverse this beneficent process.

### TEST BY PROBABLE EFFECT.

Let us for a moment suppose the agitation successful; what would be its practical result? The badge of a public stigma would be affixed to the brewer and publican classes. There would not, as a result, be fewer brewers and publicans, but worse ones. To treat men like pariahs tends to make them act like pariahs. Public reprobation of a section means its moral deterioration. The influence of a degraded class is, in its turn, degrading. Hence the effect of the agitation, if successful, would be to drive the best men out of the trade and leave it in the hands of those less likely to work their business in the interests of moderation and sobriety. Thus a movement springing from a horror of drunkenness would lessen the check on that vice by lowering the social and moral standard of those whose trade placed them between the drink and the drinker.

Burke has told us that it is foolish to indict a nation. Might we not say that it is both foolish and unjust to condemn wholesale any class which the recognised needs of society call into existence? Nowadays there is too much whitewashing of one section and blackening of another. The truth is that men cannot, in this simple and easy fashion, be divided into the two categories of angels and devils. We are mixed creatures. There is some evil in the best of us and some good in the worst. We have to live together in society and make the best of one another. The path of progress does not lie along the line of class-stigma and degradation, but in the direction of mutual toleration and kindly feeling. The public will get most out of any section by appealing to the best in them, not the worst. When good men forget this elementary fact, and flourish a brand-new branding-iron, with which they seek to mark a class not fortunate enough to be included within the range of their Christian charity, they must be told that what they wish

to effect would not merely degrade the class at which their action is aimed, but also those very drunkards whom they sincerely wish to elevate. To make a necessary class into a helot class is poor policy, for the section so degraded requites society for the gratuitous injustice by infecting with its own debasement those brought within the sphere of its influence.

### WHO IS TO BLAME FOR DRUNKENNESS?

The root question of the whole matter is—at whose door does the blame for drunkenness justly lie? Common sense suggests that he who performs an act is the one responsible for that act. On this theory we judge one another every day of our lives. We blame the murderer for his murder, the thief for his theft, the libeller for his libel. The law of the land, which registers and gives effect to the general opinion of society, holds that wrong-doers must answer for wrong-doing. The Christian religion, too, teaches that the sinner is accountable before God for his sin. When Wesley wrote hymns for “mourners convinced of sin,” he was not thinking of penitents convinced of the sins of other people, but of their own. But our teetotal friends hold that the brewer and publican are responsible not only for their own sins, but for those of the drunkard too. That these two classes should be made a scapegoat to bear the sins of the drunkard into the wilderness of ostracism is grossly unjust, and impossible to be reconciled with any system of ethics, whether pagan or Christian. The correct view has been clearly stated by a prominent member of the “Citizens’ Committee.” The Rev. S. E. Keeble, in his work, “Industrial Day-dreams,” says (p. 310): “After all, working men are moral agents, and responsible for their actions.” In these words Mr. Keeble surrenders the key of the position. If, as Mr. Keeble truly says, working men are moral agents, and as such responsible for their actions, the answer to our leading question is plain. Who is to blame for drunkenness? Obviously, first and foremost, the drunkard.

## THE CRAVING FOR DRINK—HISTORICAL SKETCH.

But, our opponents might reply, even if we admit that, speaking generally, it is the drunkard who is responsible for his own excess, yet he has to contend with an internal craving for drink faced with the external opportunity for its gratification, and it is this disastrous conjunction with which, as a matter of fact, we have to-day to deal. Let us then consider for a moment the origin of this craving for drink. On such a question short views can scarcely escape being false views. The drinking habits of the people are not a thing of yesterday. Mr. Keeble assigns as one predisposing condition our keen Northern climate, which was certainly not invented by wicked brewers or publicans. His words are (p. 306): "There is no doubt that the nipping, eager, wrathful cold of this Northern climate has predisposed the Anglo-Saxon race to the use of fiery stimulants; but this predisposition has been largely fostered by the social and industrial condition of the masses of the people for centuries. Time was when beer, with its permanent possibilities of excess, was the staple drink at the meals at which now universally tea and coffee are drunk. The insufficient food, the exhausting labour, and the degrading surroundings and habits of past industrial generations have also handed down to present times hereditary alcoholic cravings." These are wise words from the pen of Mr. Keeble, the author; but they accord very ill with the attempt of Mr. Keeble, the agitator, to lay the blame of the drink craving on the shoulders of the brewer and publican.

The truth is that no one can study the social history of England without being painfully struck with the drunken habits of the people. The rich and titled were as bad as the poor, or worse. What a record of hard drinking on the part of the nobility is condensed into the discreditable phrase, "as drunk as a lord!" The "three-bottle man," in the time of the Georges, gloried in his achievement. One of them, when asked if he had really drunk three bottles of port over dinner on a certain occasion without assistance, replied, "Well, I had the assistance of a bottle

of Madeira to help it down." At the banquets of the great it was at one time not unusual, in order to prevent cases of suffocation, to place a little boy under the table, whose duty it was to loosen the neckcloths of the guests as they fell senseless to the floor. It is recorded of one Lord Chancellor that, wishing to get away from a banquet earlier than the other guests, he achieved his purpose by slipping down to the floor as if dead drunk. Crawling the length of the table along the floor he escaped from the room without arousing the attention of his boon companions, who were themselves already too far gone in drink to observe movements a few yards away.

As might be expected, the poorer classes imitated the richer so far as their opportunities allowed. At Haddon Hall the visitor is shown an iron ring into which was fitted the wrist of the retainer who had failed to drink the whole of his quantum of beer. As he stood with his arm raised and securely fastened, the liquor he had declined was poured down his open sleeve. This was in the old baronial days, and the hard-drinking habit persisted to comparatively recent times. Readers of Dickens do not need to be reminded of the large amount of drinking depicted in his pages. Men drank on any and every occasion—at births, christenings, marriages, and funerals. They drank at work and at play, on week-days and Sundays. Feast days were often scenes of riotous drunkenness. Even the completion of a bargain or the casual meeting of friends was held to justify a friendly glass. All classes were implicated. The clerical predecessors of Canon Hicks and his Free Church associates and the legal predecessors of Mr. R. D. Darbshire were not backward as consumers of drink. The medical predecessors of Dr. Vipont Brown prescribed intoxicants, and in that case, at least, freely took their own medicine. Law-makers are also partly to blame, as in the notable example of Mr. Gladstone's Grocers' Licenses Bill, which, though good in intention, in practice promoted drinking among women. It is unnecessary to pursue the point further. Enough has been said to show that the craving for drink, as it exists to-day, is due to the alcoholic habit of many

generations of Englishmen. For that hereditary tendency, and the unfavourable social conditions which fostered its development, the nation is responsible as a nation. If blame is to be allocated in the matter, let it be impartially assigned to all classes, not unjustly accumulated upon one. If only the class that is without sin is allowed to throw the first stone, no stones will be thrown.

### WHO CREATES THE OPPORTUNITY FOR DRINKING?

But, say our opponents, it is the presence of the public-house which spreads before frail human nature a "temptation" which, by reason of the alcoholic habit, it is often unable to resist. Who, then, is responsible for the drinking facilities which exist? Did the English people sanction the opening of public-houses in order to enrich brewers and gratify publicans? The idea is absurd. The vast majority of Englishmen call for the local supply by the publican of the article produced by the brewer, and it is to meet this huge demand that brewers brew and publicans vend the article asked for. Parliament, voicing the will of the nation, sanctions the traffic, regulates it, and draws many millions of revenue annually from the business. It is obvious, therefore, that public-houses exist primarily for the convenience of the public, as indeed their name suggests. Like any other article offered for sale, drink must be vended somewhere if it is vended at all, and to meet the wants of prospective customers houses licensed for the sale of intoxicants have been opened under certain conditions in town and country. Hence the public-house, with its opportunity of reasonable use and of possible abuse, stands open, for it is impossible to supply the needs of moderate and reasonable drinkers—the great majority—without at the same time offering opportunities for over-indulgence to immoderate drinkers. It is quite clear, then, that the temptation involved in the challenge of the open public-house to the man possessed with the drink craving owes its occurrence to the national demand for drink facilities, and not to the brewer or publican as such.

# WHAT THE PUBLICAN MAY JUSTLY BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR.

Our argument, if admitted to be valid, suffices to clear from blame the brewer who is a simple brewer. A brewer is not a prophet that he should say, "The beer in these vats will be consumed by moderate drinkers and the beer in that vat by immoderate ones, so I will send out these and keep back the other." Removed as he is from the scene of detailed consumption, he is no more answerable for excessive drinking, which incidentally increases his business turnover, than a wholesale flour merchant or miller is responsible for the gluttony which has a similar effect on his trade returns. But the publican, brought face to face with customers of every class, finds his real responsibility beginning at this point. While it is grossly unjust to blame him for the existence of public-houses, with their temptation to moral weaklings, or for the drink craving, which, like the public-house, traces its origin back many centuries before he was born, the publican may fairly be called upon to conduct his business in the direction of moderation and sobriety. All excessive drinking on licensed premises should be discouraged. Not on account of the wickedness of the publican, but on account of the drunkard's folly, the law of the land has hedged round the trade with numerous restrictions. These restrictions should be loyally observed by the publican, both in the letter and in the spirit. The majority of publicans do act in this manner. They are respectable men, who conduct their houses in a reputable manner. The class of hotel-keepers, in particular, are, in most cases, gentlemen in the best sense of the word; were they not so, they could scarcely fill the positions they occupy. Of course, publicans have some black sheep in their ranks; but in this matter they are not alone. An objection that can be urged against every class loses its edge as against any one class.

Clearly, then, it is the misfortune, rather than the fault of the publican, that the moral self-control of certain of his customers is apt to break down over the

consumption of the articles he vends. But so long as the publican honestly discourages excessive drinking the odium attaching to excess cannot fairly be laid upon him. As the reasonable drinker takes the credit of his own moderation, so the drunkard must accept the blame of his own drunkenness.

It is on this principle that people act in all other departments of trade. The sale of poisons by druggists is hedged round with restrictions, but these ordinances are not held to reflect discredit on the druggist who is subject to them. Everyone recognises that the regulations are aimed at preventing abuse by possible customers. No one blames chemists if in a few cases men poison themselves despite all precautions. Notwithstanding the great mischief wrought by grocers' licenses, we hear no wholesale denunciation of the grocers holding those licenses. So, too, tobacconists are quite leniently judged in view of the harm resulting from juvenile smoking. When we contrast the consideration with which these classes are treated with the harsh condemnation meted out to publicans, we realise how void of justification is the outcry against the latter class. The moral indignation of our agitators is under such strict class-control that it is hard to attribute its censorious attitude to publicans to any other cause than prejudice. Their antipathy to the brewer and publican causes them to labour under an acquired inability to do justice to those classes.

#### NOT BREWER ONLY, BUT ALSO OWNER OF TIED HOUSES.

There are those who admit that a brewer as such, or a publican as such, cannot justly be excluded from any civic office, but who object to a man who combines the two characters in his own person. It is hard to follow such reasoning. To be a brewer is no bar, to be a publican is no bar, but to be both is a bar. The combination of two trades contains a disqualification which was in neither considered separately. Zero plus zero produces a positive quantity. This is neither mathematics nor logic, but pure conjuring. If, as the proverb tells us, two blacks do not make a white, neither do two whites make a black.

But, say our critics, Mr. Holt is not merely a publican, but a multiple publican—an owner of tied houses on a large scale. It seems to me little less than absurd to fight the Mayoralty question on so subordinate an issue as the expediency or inexpediency of the tied-house system. If that system is bad, let it be attacked openly and directly, not casually and incidentally. Let the honourable weapon of legislation be employed, not the dishonourable tool of social boycott. But the party of opposition has decreed otherwise. They prefer side issues and flank attacks. Possessing, as they do, in a marked degree, the faculty of making molehills into mountains, they have exercised their unrivalled magnifying powers on this small point until it bulks largely before the public gaze. In a scientific treatise the author, when giving a cut of some minute object, will tell you that it is magnified so many times, but our agitators wish their exaggerated pictures to be taken as representing life-size.

Let us try to bring the matter into something like perspective. To begin with, then, it must be noted that the tied-house system is merely one example of an economic movement by no means confined to the area of drink-supply. One may very well sympathise with the small grocer, managing his one shop and living on the premises, without feeling justified in condemning the multiple-grocer as an outcast unfit to enjoy full civic rights. The same remark applies to the small boot shops in relation to such a boot firm as Messrs. Freeman, Hardy, and Willis, the head of which in Leicester has been knighted, and has also held the office of mayor of that town with general acceptance. So, too, of the single shop in general as contrasted with the mammoth establishment of a universal provider like the late Mr. Whiteley. A friend of mine who happened to meet Mr. Jesse Boot, of "Boots', Cash Chemists," fame, said to him, "Well, Mr. Boot, I am afraid that my personal sympathies are rather with the single-shop druggist, whom your multiplied establishments tend to squeeze out of existence." Mr. Boot's reply was, "You must admit, Mr. C., that the old method was a less scien-

tific mode of distribution. My justification is that in my shops the public are more cheaply and efficiently served with fresher drugs than is possible, on the average, in the single-shop system."

This suggestive answer brings us round to the really vital question in reference to tied houses—Is the system injurious to the public and to the cause of sobriety, and that to such an extent as to justify the exclusion from high civic office of all connected with it? We have shown that the multiple system is not confined to the drink supply, and that no such odium is attached to its development in other departments. For our teetotal friends everything connected with the drink traffic takes on a darker hue. Looking at the brewer through the coloured glasses of class prejudice, they impute to him the hue which only exists in their own spectacles.

But let us pass from this general presumptive argument to the more detailed consideration of its effect on sobriety. It is obvious that the owners of tied houses are more likely to be men of social standing, and as such more amenable to public opinion than an average individual publican "free from the brewer" can possibly be. I mean no disrespect to independent publicans, but it is obvious that such men can rarely hope to enjoy the position of a multiple owner. *Noblesse oblige!* High position carries with it high social ideals, a quicker sensitiveness to public feeling, a keener desire to stand well with one's social equals. Some may think that I am too optimistic on this point, but I submit that an English gentleman is likely to act the part of a gentleman in trade as in private life, and that a man of wealth has fewer temptations to encourage drunkenness than one of narrower means. This seems to me not mere good-natured fancy, but to follow from the very nature of things.

The system of tied houses makes possible greater unity of control. Take a single specimen from the region, not of mere speculation, but of fact. When Mr. Holt heard of the practice of distributing sweets to child-customers he ordered it to be stopped. It was stopped accordingly, and in all probability will never be resumed. Now, if the

houses under Mr. Holt's control had been kept by as many independent publicans, the objectionable action might not have been brought to an end so summarily and effectually, and the guarantees against its recurrence would not be so solid and effective.

The opponents of Mr. Holt deal largely in suspicions. They make insinuation do duty for proof and imagination for fact. "Charity," says St. Paul, "thinketh no evil"; but where a brewer is concerned our friends exemplify the charity which thinketh all evil. They draw terrible pictures of a tied-house owner unduly influencing our local Watch Committee. They do not realise how the advancement to high office affects a man of high worth, how it puts him doubly upon his honour, and how much more likely his fellow-councillors are to influence him than he is to sway them. Mr. Holt is not an ogre, who exerts a maleficent power over his colleagues whilst himself incapable of receiving any benign influence in return. He is an English citizen, who naturally desires to conduct the houses under his control in such a way as to secure the approval of his fellow-councillors. And if the frailty of a percentage of his customers renders some degree of over-drinking an inevitable incident of the traffic, it is his wish, as much as theirs, to reduce this undesired and undesirable excess to a minimum. From this point of view the association of a brewer and multiple publican with the other councillors in the government of the city appears to tend towards the better government of the houses he owns. And the higher the civic office, the fiercer is the light that beats upon his actions, the more closely and keenly are they scrutinised and judged. Not only is there this external guarantee of rectitude, but the man's own sense of public duty comes into even fuller responsive play, and he resolves that his fellow-townsmen shall see him for what he is—a citizen incapable of prostituting a public office for private ends. The somewhat unworthy suspicion that Alderman Holt would, as Mayor, unduly influence the Watch Committee cannot be better dismissed than in the words of Councillor Thewlis, Chairman of that Committee, when he said, "Alderman Holt could not if he would, and would not if he could."

### THE "PUSHING BREWER" ARGUMENT.

The British public, by their demand for drinking facilities, have practically created the trades of the brewer and the publican. Obviously, when a trade is thus called into existence, trade interests arise at the same time. A business created by the public demand, and living by the satisfaction of that demand, may reasonably ask for fair treatment at the hands of the public. A recognised business must be allowed a certain degree of scope. When a fresh district becomes built upon and occupied, a certain proportion of the new population may be presumed to desire drinking facilities, while a certain proportion objects to their being provided. Now, if Mr. Holt had the power to plant public-houses in the new district in the same way that a grocer can open his shops therein, and if he employed this independent power to any large extent, he might justly be called a "pushing brewer." But our teetotal friends know quite well that no brewer has any such power. All that he can do is to ask for a license, and it would argue poor business ability to seek a license for a district in which no one would use the new public-house if opened. In making his application he speaks for prospective customers in the new area. Those who object to the granting of the license are as free to state their case against the brewer's request as he is to produce arguments in its favour. Only when both sides have been heard is the decision given, and that by an independent and impartial tribunal. If the justices consider that a case has been made out, the license is granted; if not, it is refused. They do not permit new facilities without having carefully inspected the locality, and seen for themselves the requirements of the neighbourhood. When granted, the surrender of a license or licenses in some other part of the city is usually a condition of the grant, so that the total number of licensed houses is rather diminished than increased. Mr. Holt, in his speech before the City Council, early in October, said: "Whatever new licenses have been granted to me I have given substantial value for them in the surrenders of

ante-1869 licenses (purchased from other brewers), and so reduced the facilities for drinking in the slums." That a new licensed house should be opened in a suburb where the temptation to excessive drinking can more easily be resisted by the resident population, while beerhouses are correspondingly closed in congested districts, where the people are, from their surroundings, less able to withstand the temptation, represents, on the whole, a gain to the cause of temperance.

Returning to the point under discussion, it is evident that a licensed house cannot be "pushed" or "thrust" on a new district by Mr. Holt or any other brewer. As well might counsel for the Crown, in a criminal trial, be charged with pushing or thrusting a prisoner into penal servitude merely because he stated the case against the accused. He only sets one side before the Court, counsel for the prisoner puts the other, and the actual verdict is pronounced independently of them both. So the question of new facilities is practically a sort of trial in which Mr. Holt is, as it were, counsel for the application, Mr. Batty or some similarly disposed gentleman is counsel against, while the ultimate decision rests in the hands of the justices.

That Mr. Holt has not been more active than other brewers in applying for new licenses was admitted by the *Manchester Guardian*. Its words were: "We do not know that Mr. Holt has been more diligent in regard to it than his local competitors in trade." One wonders, in view of this fact, that the Rev. J. Kirk Maconachie should write: "It is constantly being asked where we are going to draw the line. I suggest that a line may properly be drawn between the reasonable supply of a reasonable demand and the anti-social practice of persistently thrusting a dangerous trade upon places that do not want it." On this we remark (1) as to the "reasonable supply of a reasonable demand" there is some confusion of thought. The words suggest that potential customers invite brewers to supply them with facilities, whereas everybody knows that it is the recognised part of the trade to apply for a license on behalf of those likely to use facilities. As to

whether this demand is reasonable or not is the very point which the magistrates have to decide. If there is not a prospective "reasonable" demand the request for a license is not granted. (2) The phrase "anti-social" begs the question. Might not those in a new district who would use facilities if granted say that the opposing party were "anti-social" because they practically said, "We do not want facilities, and therefore you who do shall not have them"? Living in a country where facilities are the rule, they set themselves against this social rule, and seek, in an anti-social spirit, to impose their will on that large section of society which differs from them on this section. (3) "Persistently thrusting" is a phrase the hollowness of which has already been fully exposed. It simply means applying for a license. Mr. Maconachie seems as much horrified at this audacity as was Mr. Bumble when poor Oliver Twist ventured to "ask for more." (4) "A dangerous trade." The word "dangerous" is a pure appeal to prejudice. To call it a recognised trade would have been more relevant. We have already shown that the public created the trade, that the existing system is one of granting facilities, and that what element of "danger" there is owes its existence to causes towards which all classes have contributed. (5) "Places that do not want it." This is misleading. If nobody in the new place would use facilities, the brewer would be foolish to ask for a license, and the magistrates would act unwisely in granting one. On the point as to whether a license is desirable, a new district is not a single unit with a single will, as Mr. Maconachie's phrase suggests. Some inhabitants are in favour of a new license, others are against it. The whole duty of the magistrates is to determine whether the former class is, in their opinion, numerous enough to justify the issue of a new license. If they decide that it is, the place in question is not a "place that does not want" a license, but one that does. Mr. Maconachie's sentence, which we have now passed in review, is seen to be crammed with inaccuracies at the rate of one to a line. Yet his letter was a not unfavourable specimen of what passed for argument on that side.

### “PUSHING” AGITATORS.

The present policy in England is one of permitting facilities, not entirely prohibiting them, but the attacks on Mr. Holt as a “pushing” brewer rest on the tacit assumption that prohibition is the national rule. Those who so strenuously object to all new licenses in growing suburbs are practically working to constitute areas of total prohibition. They are the “pushing” people, for they seek to “push” the principles of prohibition in a country that does not accept them. Their moral standard condemns the manufacture and sale of drink, and they never weary of “pushing” these standards on people who reject them. Living in a society which recognises the drink traffic, they pursue the anti-social practice of persistently “thrusting” their views, with insulting expressions, on their neighbours. Our agitators interferingly “thrust” their views as to the Mayoralty on the Council, and even when defeated at the polls they gave one last “push” by thrusting their wonderfully-signed “manifesto” on the Council. To vary a line of Goldsmith, “E’en though vanquished, they kept ‘pushing’ still.”

If I wished to express my condemnation of the unreasonable lengths to which this agitation has been carried, I could not better do so than by re-writing Mr. Maconachie’s sentence with the alteration of two or three words. In its revised version the sentence would read: “I suggest that a line may properly be drawn between the reasonable presentation of a reasonable objection and the anti-social practice of persistently thrusting an objectionable agitation on people who do not want it.”

### BRIEF REVIEW OF ARGUMENT.

We have now shown that the drink craving, which is at the root of drunkenness, is largely due to physical and climatic conditions, aggravated by an unfavourable social environment—that in the past all classes, whether ministers of religion, lawyers, doctors, or other sections, have contributed towards the present position of the drink

problem—that the brewer and publican have been called into existence by the public for the convenience of the public—that the majority of Englishmen ask for reasonable facilities, and that there is a fairly general use of such facilities when granted—that the brewer, when he brews beer, cannot tell whether it will be consumed by the moderate or immoderate drinker, so that the moral character of the consumption is outside his influence, and therefore outside his responsibility—that the publican, when he opens his doors, cannot prevent the entry of intemperate drinkers along with temperate ones—that so far any responsibility which exists is shared by the brewer and publican in an equal degree with the remaining classes of their fellow-countrymen and in no other, but that at this point the special and peculiar moral obligation of the publican emerges, for he is bound by his duty to the community to conduct his house in a strictly temperate sense, and to resist the temptation to exploit the drunkard's moral infirmity for his private profit. Our teetotal friends are apt to seize upon this clash between the interests of sobriety on the one hand and the immediate trade-gains of the publican on the other, as if such discrepancy were peculiar to the drink traffic. This is a mistake. The solicitor is equally tempted to pile up his bill of costs to an undue height, the doctor's immediate interest is against the too rapid recovery of his patient, the minister of religion is tempted to turn from the poor in order to pay court to the rich and influential, members of Parliament are tempted to neglect the interests of the nation in order to further their private ends, those who supply articles of food and drugs to the public are tempted to rob their customers by means of adulteration, and so on through the whole category. In all classes alike a certain percentage yield to the temptation incidental to their calling. Here it is a Palmer, of Rugeley, who poisons his patient to secure a friendly bequest; there it is a Jabez Balfour, who passes from the House of Commons to penal servitude; here it is a rascally solicitor, who is struck off the rolls; there it is a milk-seller, who is convicted for adulteration. Publicans in

this matter are neither more than human nor less than human, as the record of licenses endorsed for mismanagement of licensed premises proves. But the ratio of such endorsements is small, and has greatly declined in the last twenty years. It is worth noting that while the proportion of offenders against the Food and Drugs Act in the way of adulteration reached, according to the latest statistics, no less than 9·3 per cent of the samples of food and drugs reported on by the public analysts, the percentage of vendors of liquid refreshment whose licenses were dealt with for offences against the Act was quite small by comparison. These facts show that publicans do, as a matter of fact, generally carry on their business in a spirit and manner consistent with the interests of sobriety. Hence, any trade disability, such as is proposed by the Citizens' Committee, is quite unjustified.

If brewers and publicans exist, they must rank not as half citizens, but as full citizens. It has been shown that there is no ground for discriminating against these two classes. Who are the men who clamour for the erection of new trade disabilities? A certain number of illiberal Liberals, who forget that one of the first principles of Liberalism is civic equality—a band of “Free” Churchmen who give the lie to their name by seeking to make a class less free, and, themselves liberated from religious disabilities, strive to erect new trade disabilities against others—a band of philanthropists, whose love of their kind proves quite compatible with strong dislike of a portion of their kind. These ultra-good men, united by the bond of a common antipathy, and deriving from the gospel of love the inspiration of hate, allow Mr. Holt to be elected councillor without protest, then to be advanced to the aldermanic bench—still without protest—but when he emerges at the top, and is proposed for the Mayoralty, they proceed to tomahawk him quite in the spirit of a tribe of wild Indians out on the warpath.

#### THE CASE OF OLIVER CROMWELL.

This dislike of the brewer as such is quite a modern thing. There seems some ground for holding that a brew-

house existed in connection with Cromwell's family, but any such association of the great Oliver with the brewing interest did not prevent his ultimately attaining the highest office in the land—that of Lord Protector of the Realm. So great was the esteem in which the Puritans of his own day held Cromwell. And our modern Puritans take up the tale of his praise. A local Nonconformist has presented to the city the statue of Cromwell which stands near the Cathedral. In a recent publication of the Free Church Council he is hailed as one of the great "Free Church pioneers." Yet Cromwell's attitude did not always coincide with their's. In repudiating the claim of the Scotch Covenanting clergy to suppress dissent from their opinions in order to suppress error he made use of a remarkable illustration. His words were: "*Your pretended fear lest error should step in is like a man who would keep all wine out of the country lest men should be drunk. It will be found an unjust and an unwise jealousy to deprive a man of his natural liberty upon supposition he may abuse it. When he doth abuse it, judge.*"

#### MR. GLADSTONE AS DRINK-DISTRIBUTOR AND BREWER- ENNOBLER.

The case of Mr. Gladstone presents a somewhat similar difficulty. He was for many years the "Grand Old Man" of teetotalers and Free Churchmen. Yet his practice and opinions in reference to intoxicants were not theirs. It was he who raised a brewer (Mr. Bass) to the peerage under the title of Lord Burton. Moreover, by originating and passing into law the Grocers' Licenses Bill Mr. Gladstone opened up new channels for the distribution of drink throughout the land, whilst Mr. Holt merely works on old and well-accustomed lines in this particular district. Yet those who now tell us in words that a drink distributor on a local scale and on old lines is not fit to be Lord Mayor of Manchester told us formerly by deeds that a drink distributor on a national scale and on original lines was worthy to be Prime Minister.

## A RISING STANDARD.

Some urge, in reply, that the standard suggested by the teetotalers of to-day may very well be higher than that of past times, and that the movement they support is to be commended as part of a general rise in the ethical standard of society. We have already shown that the proposed application of the new rule involves civil disability and class persecution, by making one particular section a scapegoat for the sins of the community. Progress does not lie along the lines of injustice, liberty can only suffer from narrowing its bounds, righteousness in civic life is not promoted by the perpetration of unrighteous acts.

It is not open to Christian men to set up for a secular office a higher standard than they erect for membership of their own Churches, and for the holding of office therein. If the Church, which claims to embody Christ's kingdom on earth, is not better than the world, it is no Church, but a mere organised hypocrisy. Worldly men smile when professing Christians virtually say to the brewer, "We call your trade 'the devil's trade,' but we gladly accept money made in this 'devil's trade' to help on the cause of God and build houses for His worship. We admit you to membership and office in the Church, but we do not consider that you are fit to be Mayor of Manchester. We are working up society to a higher ethical plane, and we are beginning, not with those inside the Churches, but with those outside. When we have sufficiently thrust up the world from below, we may in time ourselves rise to its superior moral level. In the meantime the growing sensitiveness of our conscience finds its first application, not on our immediate associates, but on those more remote. The operating stringency of our conscience varies directly, not inversely, as the square of the distance." This may be modern Free Churchism, but it clashes with the words of Jesus, "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven."—Matt. v. 20.

## PRACTICAL EFFECT.

We have already shown that the intolerant policy of the Citizens' Committee is radically unjust, and that it would be also impolitic to degrade brewers and publicans. Any such degradation would tend to lower the moral status of members of the trade, and thereby increase the amount of drunkenness. To throttle the brewer is not to throttle the drink traffic, although agitators act as if such were the case. The utter unfairness of their attitude makes one feel that they labour under an acquired inability to mete out common fairness to the other side. In the whole course of the agitation not one word has been said by them in recognition of the unobjectionable way in which most licensed houses are at present conducted. No one has given present-day publicans credit for the great improvement in public-house management which has taken place. The decline of twenty millions a year in the national drink bill within seven years, in the face of a growing population, is a fact to which they seem blind. The operation of Mr. Balfour's Act in steadily reducing licenses is equally ignored. Instead of dealing with these relevant and vital facts, they construct out of their inner consciousness a bogey brewer and bogey publican, wherewith to frighten band of hope children and the general public, and steadily refuse to look at the real publican of flesh and blood. The reason is obvious. The truth does not fit in with their preconceived theory; hence it must be ignored. If the facts are against them, so much the worse for the facts.

## REACTION ON PERSONNEL OF CITY COUNCIL.

Abuse of the City Council sometimes comes from unexpected quarters. Miss Mary Dendy, speaking at a meeting held to promote the candidature of Miss Margaret Ashton, is reported to have said that there were "many duffers" in the Manchester City Council. That lady has given special attention to the care of the feeble-minded children in the city schools. It is possible to award due recognition to this excellent work on the part of Miss

Dendy, whilst regretting her rather contemptuous reference to the membership of the City Council. She owes her position on the Manchester Education Committee to the courtesy of the Council which contains these "duffers" in co-opting her on that body. Does not this appreciative act on their part deserve a better response than contumelious language? Perhaps Miss Dendy considers that as she has taken special care of the mentally-defective children in the schools, so she must exercise a similar oversight in reference to the mentally-defective members of the City Council. It stands to the credit of the "many duffers" in that body that they have at least sense enough left to recognise their own deficiencies, and judgment sufficient to supplement them by adding Miss Dendy to their number. This sign of grace should suffice to save them from that lady's scorn.

It would weary my readers to refer to all the objectionable language employed in reference to the City Council in the course of this controversy. One man speaks of that body as taking refuge in a "guilty silence," because they transact their business in the place built for that very purpose—that is, the Town Hall. Another makes the ridiculous assertion that in following the usual order of procedure the Council had no "mandate whatever on the question at issue," as if the "mandate," whatever the word may mean, were a part of our municipal constitution. A third demands a referendum, and so on. I feel bound to express my deep indignation at the hustling, brow-beating tactics employed by those opposed to Mr. Holt's election, and in so doing I am only voicing the opinion of many beside myself. That a minority should seek to impose its will on the majority, that a self-appointed group of citizens should dictate to the duly-elected representatives of the people, and demand the withdrawal of Mr. Holt's candidature by the Council, when that body could not take such a step without incurring general contempt—all this was strange conduct on the part of men who profess adherence to representative principles. The voice of the people, it would seem, is only the voice of God, when it is an echo of their own.

What is the natural reaction of this agitation on the personnel of the City Council? The whole status of that body would be lowered if our agitators had their way. The Council would sink in public esteem, and citizens of character and business ability would scarcely care to enter a body which was not allowed to govern the city it was expressly chosen to govern. Coteries of irresponsible citizens would usurp the constitutional functions of the city's elected representatives; and it would be seen that an agitation started with the professed intention of raising the character and status of the head of the Council, would tend to lower it in a most disastrous fashion, by keeping out of the Council the very men best fitted to perform its duties.

#### ONLY A BEGINNING: OBSTA PRINCIPIIS.

Those who are inclined to think that I offer too vehement an opposition to this agitation, would do well to read the letters of those who attack Mr. Holt. In these we are fairly warned that the objection to that gentleman's election is only one engagement at the commencement of a long campaign. They are going to ostracize other classes in their turn. Nothing could be more explicit than the statement of Dr. Vipont Brown on this point. He says: "The question has often been asked, 'Where are you going to stop?' The true answer is, we are not going to stop. This is only the beginning—not the end." When brewers and publicans are robbed of their civic rights and degraded into a helot class, other sections will be dealt with one by one. Divide and conquer is the maxim of Mr. Robert Lewis and his followers. They do not care to specify too precisely which class is to be the next victim of their intolerance, because they need the aid of all the doomed classes in the onslaught on that particular section which is the immediate object of their attack. Just as they see nothing immoral in their invitation to beer drinkers to condemn the man who brews the beer they consume, so our conscientious friends deem it highly moral to ask help from

those about to be harried in their efforts to harry the section under actual treatment at their hands. Can the Manchester public view with equanimity the progressive raid on class after class with which they are openly threatened? Would our city be a desirable place of residence if its population were sharply divided into saints and sinners, with the Citizens' Committee posing as the chosen people of the Lord in the Land of Canaan while the classes they viewed with disfavour would be the Hittites and Hivites, the Perizzites and Jebusites to be harried out of the land? If this prospect is unpleasing to ordinary citizens there is only one way of preventing its realisation. "*Obsta principiis*"—stop it at the start.

#### THE RULE OF THE SAINTS—IN THEORY.

Although those who propose to introduce the millennium into Manchester by way of a series of class disabilities do not at present care to name the sections marked out for their charitable attentions, yet they lay down certain guiding principles which are sufficiently illuminating. Mr. Robert Lewis, who gave the lead in the agitation, writes: "In short, no man ought to be tempted to any wrong action." It is true that he applies his maxim to Mr. Holt's case, but, unless there is to be one rule for Mr. Holt's moral welfare and another for that of other men, the principle is of general application. Mr. Lewis cannot be allowed to set up tests the edge of which shall cut only against one man or one class. We are landed, then, in the millennium as conceived by Mr. Lewis. This ideal state is one in which no man is to be tempted to any wrong action. Utopia, according to our arch-agitator, is to be reached by the total abolition of temptation. This is the nursery view of life, and can scarcely be acceptable to grown men, who have left the nursery some considerable distance behind them. Such men will prefer the guidance of Saint Paul to that of Mr. Lewis—"When I became a man I put away childish things." Manchester citizens have left their first childhood behind them, and their acceptance of Mr. Lewis's dictum will scarcely be possible till they begin to qualify for their second.

### WHAT DR. E. VIPONT BROWN HAS IN STORE FOR US.

In a self-revealing letter Dr. Vipont Brown suggests a test which is not unlike that of Mr. Lewis. After mentioning some of the classes which in the good time coming are to be degraded from full citizenship to the level of an inferior caste, he states, in so many words, that those will be considered unfit for positions of public trust "who take advantage in any way of their fellow-men." My readers will observe that this is not merely a class test, but also a personal test. Take the case of a medical man. We may suppose that Dr. Brown would declare that such a candidate's calling was no bar to office, for is it not his own profession? But even a doctor has opportunities of taking advantage of his fellow men, and a doctor candidate must be able to prove that he has not personally succumbed to these temptations before he satisfies Dr. Brown's condition. Obviously, then, we want first of all an inquisition of classes with a view to objectionable occupations being placed along with brewers and publicans on the list of pariahs, and in the next place we shall need an individual inquisition to determine whether any particular candidate from an uncondemned class is fit for public office. May I be allowed to suggest the name of Dr. Brown for the post of Grand Inquisitor? Should our new censor require assistance in his task, members of the Citizens' Committee could be called in to examine the public and private life of candidates for public office. They could scarcely have a more congenial task. The only difficulty is that Manchester citizens may decline to bow their heads to such a yoke.

### THE PRESIDENT OF THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE.

The Rev. J. S. Simon, Governor of Didsbury College and President of the Wesleyan Conference, has also intervened in this controversy, and indicated a test to be applied to candidates for the mayoralty. His words are:—"We have a very strong belief that in reference to our highest civic officer he should be a man without

reproach and without shame, and a man who can stand forth and say: 'Through my influence or the influence of my business no harm is done to any living soul.' The standard is a high one; too high, I fear, for this world of weak and sinful men. How many members even of the Citizens' Committee itself can lay their hands on their hearts and truthfully say "Through my influence no harm is done to any living soul"? Have they not by their recent action done grievous wrong to an upright and honourable man? The truth is that if Mr. Simon's test is to be construed literally certain high offices could never be filled, and it is doubtful whether the presidency of the Wesleyan Conference might not occasionally be vacant for want of a qualified candidate. Let me respectfully ask Mr. Simon to judge his own action by his own standard. Manchester and Stockport are about equidistant from his residence at Didsbury College. In Stockport a Wesleyan brewer was elected mayor of that town in 1906, and re-elected in November, 1907, without a word of remark from Mr. Simon, whilst in Manchester the proposal to appoint a brewer who does not happen to be a Wesleyan has met with his public and strenuous opposition. If it was the proper course to keep silence in reference to the Stockport appointment the same rule should have been followed in reference to the Manchester one. If, on the other hand, opposition to Mr. Holt's nomination was dictated by conscience, the same conscience should have suggested a similar action in regard to Stockport. Mr. Simon stands condemned by his own standard, for either he has wronged Mr. Holt by an unwarranted public attack or he has, as chief pastor of the Wesleyan body, been lacking in faithfulness of rebuke to a brewer member of his own church.

### THREE VOICES IN UNISON.

Considering that Mr. Robert Lewis, Dr. Vipont Brown, and the Rev. J. S. Simon stated the opinions just quoted quite independently of each other, their unanimity is re-

markable, and, as Carlyle might have said, "significant of much." Mr. Lewis, whose tone and attitude in this controversy have tempted many Manchester men to wrath, holds that "no man is to be tempted to any wrong action." Dr. Brown, who by his bitter attacks on Mr. Holt has taken an unfair advantage of a fellow man, demands candidates for public offices who do not "take advantage in any way of their fellow men." The Rev. J. S. Simon, who, by the geographical variation in his moral standards, has done harm to many living souls, calls for men who can say "Through my influence no harm is done to any living soul." If these three gentlemen are to be our "custodes morum" we may well ask: "Quis custodes custodiet"? Poor, weak, frail human nature looks up at the sky-high standard erected by our trio and begs for something a little more practicable and reasonable in this work-a-day world. For society is not exclusively composed of wax-work models equally beyond the reach of the temptation which Mr. Lewis deprecates and free from the carnal imperfections to which Dr. Brown and Mr. Simon object. The millennium is not to be reached by means which contradict the facts of human nature. In the words of Hood:—

"Utopia is a pleasant place,  
But how shall I get there?  
Straight down the crooked lane,  
And all round the square."

#### THE REIGN OF THE SAINTS—IN PRACTICE.

We have so far discussed the proposed reign of the saints as a matter of theory, but fortunately the pages of history are available to show us what it has meant in practice. History writes her records in vain if we learn no lessons from them. The tale of past blunders should warn us against their repetition in the present. Let us turn, then, from the Puritans of to-day, who covet the chance of dominating Manchester life, to the Puritans of yesterday, who had the chance of dominating English life. Take, first, the Puritan rule in the time

of Cromwell, one of their greatest heroes. I give the words of Macaulay: "The Puritans in the day of their power gave cruel provocation. They proved as intolerant and meddling as ever Laud had been. They interdicted under heavy penalties the use of the Book of Common Prayer, not only in churches, but even in private houses. It was a crime in a child to read by the bedside of a sick parent one of those beautiful collects which had soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians. Severe punishments were denounced against such as should presume to blame the Calvinistic mode of worship." So much for the Puritan conception of religious liberty. Some of the Puritans of to-day rail at bishops, but how did their spiritual forefathers treat the Anglican bishops of their time? Let good Bishop Hall serve as a specimen who, stripped of his episcopal revenues and nominally accorded a State income of five hundred a year, subject to a tax of one shilling in the pound, mildly protested against the unfairness of being compelled to meet the tax on an income which had not been paid him. Let us return to the pages of Macaulay in order to see how the Puritans treated society on its more secular side: "Against the lighter vices the ruling faction waged war with a zeal little tempered by humanity or by common sense. Public amusements, from the masques which were exhibited at the mansions of the great down to the wrestling matches and the running matches on village greens, were vigorously attacked. One ordinance directed that all the maypoles in England should forthwith be hewn down. Another proscribed all theatrical diversions. The play-houses were to be dismantled, the spectators fined, the actors whipped at the cart tail. Rope-dancing, puppet-shows, bowls, horse-racing were regarded with no friendly eye. But bear-baiting, then a favourite diversion of high and low, was the abomination which most strongly stirred the wrath of the austere sectaries. The Puritans hated bear-baiting not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators." It is worth notice in passing that, unlike our modern Puritans, those of

Cromwell's day had not discovered the gentle art of brewer-baiting as a substitute for bear-baiting. It is questionable if the modern Puritan is superior in this respect.

### ONLY "THE GODLY" TO HOLD PUBLIC OFFICE.

Let us turn again to the impartial witness of the same historian. "The English Nonconformists became supreme in the State. No man could hope to rise to eminence and command but by their favour. Their favour was to be gained only by exchanging with them the signs and passwords of spiritual fraternity. One of the first resolutions adopted by Barebone's Parliament, the most intensely Puritanical of all our political assemblies, was that *no person should be admitted into the public service till the House should be satisfied of his real godliness.*" Mr. Lewis, Dr. Brown, and the Rev. J. S. Simon must feel flattered to find their own sweeping requirements as to public offices so much in harmony with those of the Puritanical assembly which took its name from a prominent member, a leather seller, called Praise God Barebone. The family likeness between them is both suggestive and instructive.

### COLLAPSE OF THE RULE OF THE "SAINTS."

For a few years the people of England bore as well as they could this rigid and austere rule. Occasionally their patience was strained to breaking point, as when the Long Parliament gave orders, in 1644, that the twenty-fifth of December should be strictly observed as a fast, and that all men should pass it in humbly bemoaning the great national sin which they and their fathers had so often committed on that day by romping under the mistletoe, eating boar's head, and drinking ale. This was too much for human endurance. The following Christmas formidable riots broke out in many places. The constables were resisted, the magistrates insulted, the houses of noted zealots attacked, and the Anglican service for the day, though forbidden by the Puritan

law, was openly read in the churches. But, despite these occasional outbursts, the people were kept under the heel of a military despotism, and it was not until the army became divided against itself that the real will of the nation could assert itself. Then it became possible to elect a Parliament free, not in name merely, but in fact. The "saints" were dispossessed, but the natural reaction from their austere rule was seen in the lamentable license of the Restoration period.

### THEN AND NOW.

It will be seen that the sway of the Puritans in England rested on the power of the sword. Rightly is Cromwell represented in his Manchester statue with his sword drawn. Puritan arms maintained and enforced on an unwilling nation the Puritanic standards. An armed minority dominated an unarmed majority. It was the tyranny of the minority.

Manchester in this matter of the majority is menaced by a similar tyranny. In this instance, however, the minority does not rely upon the sword. Indeed, it is rather nervous at the sight of a sword, and talks with something like horror of that dreadful thing "militarism." But it does not disdain to employ more ignoble weapons. Its conscience, superfine and superlative as it is, allows it to use what a local judge well called bullying, hustling, browbeating tactics. In the words of Mr. Charles Hughes they think that if they throw dirt enough they will terrorise the majority.

### THE MASSACHUSETTS CASE.

In the case of the State of Massachusetts the Puritans of the Presbyterian order were in a decided majority, and used their power in such a way as to show that when they spoke of religious freedom they meant merely freedom for others to think as they did. They established a State Church, made and enforced laws against "heresy" (their name for religious liberty), examined Quakeresses for witchcraft, imprisoned and deported them, and forbade

Quakers to reside in the State. When four Quakers, who had entered Massachusetts in defiance of this law, were ordered to leave the State, the intruders resorted to the policy of passive resistance. Their Puritan persecutors made short work of these passive resisters by hanging them all.

### THE MORAL.

What is the lesson we learn alike from the English experiment of Puritanic domination and the Massachusetts one? Do not both go to prove that very good men, prompted by the best intentions, may act in a most tyrannical manner? The pages of history show how dangerous it is to tamper with religious liberty. Englishmen, having learned the folly and wickedness of persecution, are little likely, after turning their backs on a system of religious disabilities, to adopt a policy of trade disabilities. Not even at the bidding of "Free" Churchmen will Manchester citizens make any class of their fellow-townsmen less free.

### THE AGITATION TESTED BY CHRISTIAN STANDARDS.

Most, if not all, of those who have joined in the onslaught on Mr. Holt are religious leaders or their followers—men professing to guide their lives and conduct by the teaching and example of Jesus Christ. They claim to be walking in His steps. The appeal to Christian standards is one they are bound to welcome. Let us turn then to "the law and the testimony." It will not be time lost to compare, or rather contrast, the bitter unreasonableness of these men with the sweet reasonableness of their Master.

### CHRISTIANITY WORKS FROM WITHIN.

The Christian message is addressed primarily to the inner man. It works from within outwards. It reaches and purifies the very springs of being; a clean life is but the result of a clean heart. "Make the tree good," said Christ, "and the fruit will be good." "Not that which

goeth into a man defileth him, but that which cometh out of him defileth the man." The old Gospel lends little countenance to the modern gospel, which teaches the potency of environment—the supremacy of circumstance. The spirit of Christianity is too profound to be confined to any scientific theory or economic order or social system. Those who think it is so easy to fathom must be told, "Ye have nothing to draw with, and the well is deep."

#### AFFIRMS MORAL RESPONSIBILITY.

The very heart and core of Christianity is the individual responsibility of every man to God for his own actions. The denial of man's moral responsibility dries up the very springs of individual reform, and there can be no social reform worthy of the name except by way of individual reform. If every one would mend one, all would be amended. No conceivable re-arrangement of unsocial units can make a truly social state. It is the fashion in some quarters to condemn as "individualistic" the old hymn which commences with the words—

"A charge to keep I have,  
A God to glorify."

Where else should we begin but at the beginning? The hymn just quoted starts with a man's relation to God, but it does not stop there. It proceeds to treat social service as flowing from a right relation to divine things—

"To serve the present age,  
My calling to fulfil."

As the cause precedes the effect, so our duty towards God precedes our duty towards our neighbour. To reverse the order is to put secondary for primary, and build on the model of an inverted pyramid—the very type of unstable equilibrium.

The Rev. R. J. Campbell seems to me to make this mistake. He appears to treat social relations not as the test and proof of a man's relations to the Divine, but as equivalent to the latter, or almost superseding them. Was

Robinson Crusoe incapable of entering into personal relations with the Unseen before the advent of his man Friday? So, too, Mr. Robert Blatchford, in spite of his noble nature and keen sympathy with the poor, appears to be fundamentally mistaken in his theory of moral responsibility, or rather irresponsibility. Mr. Blatchford rejects the Bible, but those to whom I am now speaking may be assumed to accept its lessons. They will probably admit that King David, in his lament over a lapse which grievously affected social relations, struck a true note when he said: "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned and done this evil in Thy sight." When the ministers of religion, full of the spirit of Christ, say to the people, "Lift up your hearts," and the people, with a glad heart and free, faithfully respond, "We lift them up unto the Lord," the true Kingdom of Heaven upon earth will be at hand.

#### CHRISTIANITY ASSUMES EXISTENCE OF TEMPTATION.

The Bible teaches that temptation is a necessary and inevitable part of a man's discipline and training on the earth. It does not say that "no man must be tempted," but that every man must be tempted. It asks not that temptation shall be entirely abolished, but completely mastered. In the life of Jesus himself temptation faced and overcome was part of the ordained discipline—

"He knows what sore temptation means,  
For He hath felt the same."

The practice of society coincides with the Bible theory on this point. Not much praise is given where no chance of going astray was presented. A blind man casts no wicked glances, but that fact is not attributed to him for righteousness. The residents in His Majesty's prisons do not break the law, but their somewhat negative virtue wins them little credit.

#### THE MAN MORE THAN HIS SURROUNDINGS.

The Gospel teaching implicitly denies the tyranny of mere circumstance—the domination of the external over

the internal. A man is assumed to possess power, by God's grace, over himself and, to some extent, over his environment also. That he really has this power to act in co-operation with the Divine influence has been proved a fact in millions of cases. Wesley could never have written his noble hymn for the Kingswood miners reclaimed under his preaching if unfavourable environment had been omnipotent. Nor could the Salvation Army of to-day claim, as they do, to have recovered five thousand drunkards in the course of last year. What prevents our protesting friends from following that example?

#### MESSAGE OR MESSENGERS AT FAULT.

Will they tell us that the Divine message has lost its former power to grip the hearts of men and to make them sober by the radical and inclusive process of making them Christians? That can hardly be, for if they believe that Christianity is a spent force, they are in a false position when they recommend it to the world. No, the failure is not in their Master or His message.

But if the fault does not lie in the message, it must lie in the messengers. Nearly nineteen hundred years have passed since Christ sent forth His disciples with the commission to preach the gospel to every creature, for over a thousand years the Christian religion has been taught in England, for several hundred years the various Free Churches have participated in the responsibility for our country's spiritual and moral welfare. Why is the total result of all these labours so inadequate and unsatisfactory? To come to the special point under consideration—the drunkenness which still too largely prevails in England—why have not Englishmen been made sober by being made truly Christian?

#### THE BLAME LAID ELSEWHERE.

One would expect that the professed physicians of souls would take some blame to themselves for the soul-sickness which prevails, that men whose business it is to inculcate

all the Christian virtues, including sobriety, would feel themselves covered with shame before God and man at their failure to do their proper work in this respect. There are few signs of such a feeling. They judge others, not themselves. Neglectful of the beam in their own eye, they would fain extract the mote out of the brewer's eye. Gathering round them the robes of their self-righteousness, they exclaim against a brewer coming between them and the wind of their holiness.

### NOT "IN HIS STEPS."

We have shown that the Christian teachers who lead this agitation run counter to some of the primal elements of Christian teaching. For they lay stress on external influences rather than internal, they nullify or reduce the principle of a man's direct responsibility for his own deeds and lay the blame of them on another class, their idea of virtue is the absence or extinction of temptation, and they make environment more potent than character.

Let us turn from theory to practice, from underlying principles to the life and conduct of their great Exemplar. Are they walking "in His steps"? Their model seems rather to be Christ's forerunner, the ascetic John the Baptist, who himself said of Christ, "He must increase, but I must decrease." Jesus contrasted John, who came "neither eating nor drinking," with Himself, the Son of Man, who came both "eating and drinking," and of whom the Pharisees of that day said, "Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." He condemned the scribes and Pharisees for setting up petty rules of their own to the neglect of the vital elements of religion—"Laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men." The "publicans" of that day—i.e., the tax gatherers who collected the impost exacted by their hated Roman rulers from the Jews, were perhaps the most unpopular class of this time. Yet He associated with them, and in the well-known parable drew a picture of the Pharisee and publican, very much to the advantage of the latter.

Just as our local critics wish Manchester to have no dealings with a brewer, so, in Christ's time, "the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans." Yet, in the touching parable of "The Good Samaritan," He represents the priest and Levite as passing by their wounded fellow-countryman, leaving him to be relieved by the despised Samaritan.

#### PUZZLE—TO FIND THE BANDIT.

A month or two ago the Rev. F. B. Meyer, who now acts as a sort of ministerial agent of the Free Church Federation, said publicly that he regarded the publican, along with two other classes he named, as the "bandits" of the present day. When he was asked if it was consistent with his sacred calling to hold up to opprobrium reputable tradesmen, he defended himself by comparing publicans to the bandits who fell on the hapless traveller in the parable just referred to. Mr. Meyer further attributed all the blame for drunkenness to the publicans; even the existence of public-houses, which is due to a general demand, was laid at their door. How different is all this from the spirit of the Master, who represented the traveller in the parable as neglected by the priest and Levite—the representatives of Mr. Meyer's own class, and tended by a member of that abused race on which the religious teachers of that day heaped opprobrium. Such evil speaking and slandering as that indulged in by Mr. Meyer disgusts reasonable men and alienates that vast body of moderate opinion whose aid teetotalers desire for their forthcoming licensing legislation. If Mr. Meyer believes that publicans are bandits, let him be consistent and make it a criminal act to manufacture or sell drink. Bandits are not licensed by law, they are clapped into prison. We do not propose new legislation to regulate bandits; we appeal to the criminal law as it has stood for centuries, and promptly lay them by the heels. But, of course, Mr. Meyer did not quite mean what he said. In calling publicans "bandits" he only employed "a terminological inexactitude." In attacking the members of a decent trade, Mr. Meyer has himself acted the part of a

religious bandit, one of the worst species of the genus. What a spectacle for gods and men to see this reverend bandit flourishing his spiritual tomahawk with the fury of a wild Indian, and careering around with the scalps of the publicans in his girdle.

#### PUBLICAN LINKED WITH BROTHEL-KEEPER.

As if it were not sufficiently offensive to liken publicans to bandits, Mr. Meyer, on the same occasion, linked together the publican and "the keeper of the immoral house." If we must, perforce, descend to the gutter level to which this champion of purity and exponent of Christian charity chooses thus to degrade the controversy, we would ask one question, which will show the wide difference between the publican and the other class with which he was associated. Can anyone imagine an England in which brothels were licensed by the justices and a State revenue of many millions drawn from the business in the same way as is done with the drink trade? One shrinks from the very idea, and the moral revulsion we feel is a measure both of the difference between the publican and the brothel-keeper and of the gravity of the insult implied in their suggested association. We in Manchester recall with regret an abusive remark made by a local dignitary of the Church. Speaking in much the same vein as Mr. Meyer, he said that he would as soon accept money for church purposes from a brothel-keeper as from a brewer. Such bitterly abusive language injures the cause it is intended to serve. It rallies to the side of the brewer and publican that large neutral class who have no strong prepossessions in the matter, and who desire no legislation which is heralded by public insult, rooted in partisan passion and aimed by vindictive and spoliatory methods rather at ruining drink-sellers than at checking the evils of drunkenness. The majority of Englishmen will decline to measure the value of any proposed legislation by the financial damage it inflicts on those connected with the drink trade. They sincerely desire to treat the brewer with substantial justice, and Mr. Meyer's outburst opens

their eyes to the fact that he and those who think with him hate the brewer too much to be able to treat him with ordinary fairness. The licensing legislation of 1908 is thus partially discredited beforehand by those who call for it, while, so far as Mr. Meyer succeeds in attaching an undeserved stigma to publicans as a class, his action tends to drive the best men out of the trade. To lower the character of publicans is, I suppose, his way of improving the management of public-houses.

### IF YOU FIGHT, FIGHT FAIRLY.

On one occasion John Wesley, when entering on a controversy in reply to a challenge, said that he did so with the greatest reluctance, because, in all the arguments between professing Christians which he had observed in his lifetime only two men had conducted their case in a manner befitting the true follower of Christ. What was true 150 years ago unhappily holds to-day, when we have abusive names made to do duty for argument, and those outsiders who venture to differ from our censors are deemed to have something amiss with their head or heart, or with both. The commonest pugilist of the past generation, who boasted no superfine conscience and professed no heaven-born morality, but who was man enough and Englishman enough to scorn delivering a blow condemned by the rules of the ring, might have given a lesson in fairness to this minister of the Free Church Federation. He does not disdain to hit below the belt. Appeals to class prejudice and class hatred are quite within his range. His injurious imputations rank him with those controversialists who "poison the wells" of discussion.

### THE "KICK" OF THE GUN.

Mr. Meyer should remember that he cannot with impunity scatter offensive imputations broadcast. Curses, like chickens, often come home to roost. Foul names are apt to recoil on those who utter them. A censorious and intolerant section challenges criticism of itself. If Mr. Meyer as a minister of religion attacks other classes, he

must be prepared to defend his own. Already there are men who ask why one class alone should merely as a class enjoy the prefix "reverend"; why the order of their religious assemblies should be protected any more than that of other gatherings, and why those who do not use their places of worship (including some who consider the teaching given therein positively mischievous) must pay a higher municipal rate in order that such buildings may be exempt from the local rates. When in reply it is urged that the excellent moral influences which flow forth upon society from these centres of religious teaching justify the preference, these men reply that the preference so given is undemocratic and constitutes a breach of the principle of equality—that the teaching given within their walls by different sects is mutually contradictory, and so cannot serve the cause of truth—that by fostering a spirit of narrow-minded intolerance they exert an anti-social influence—that the consciences of outsiders are aggrieved by being compelled to contribute towards the promulgation of doctrines which they reject, and that the ministerial class will be quite superfluous in the coming social order. Just as Mr. Meyer calls publicans social bandits, so these men dub Mr. Meyer and his ministerial friends "social parasites." Certainly the anti-social utterance of Mr. Meyer lends more countenance to those who attack his class than to those who defend it. If ever the day comes when clerics stand at the bar of public opinion to be judged as a class, the Free Church Federation will doubtless send Mr. Meyer as an envoy to the publicans to secure their support against opponents who hurl at his ministerial brethren foul names and offensive imputations. "Social bandits" are, I suppose, the natural allies of "social parasites."

#### THE SPIRIT OF THE MASTER.

Just as the members of the Citizens' Committee seek to drag brewers and publicans before the bar of public opinion in the assured expectation of their summary condemnation, so did the Scribes and Pharisees of Christ's day bring to Him a woman taken in adultery for a like

purpose. How did purity embodied treat this poor woman in her impurity? He displayed no haste to denounce, but by his silence and seeming disregard rather suggested reflection and self-judgment to her denouncers. When in response to their repeated instances He did speak, it was to enforce in words the lesson suggested by His previous silence. The answer came: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." Instead of the explicit condemnation of the accused which they anticipated, these self-righteous men were met with the implicit condemnation of themselves. Arraigned thus in the tribunal of their own consciences, they felt themselves pronounced guilty, and one by one slunk away. Then the Master, appealing to the woman's better nature, dismissed her with a gentle exhortation to a purer life.

#### FOLLOWERS WHO DO NOT FOLLOW.

How different the spirit displayed by Mr. Lewis and his friends from that of the Master whom they profess to follow. He showed no harshness to a woman who had defied the law of God and the public opinion of her kind; they hunt down an honourable citizen for supplying a commodity the use of which is not condemned by the laws of God or man. But Mr. Lewis has no misgivings on the subject. He does not stop to consult his conscience, or if he does, it is only to register its approval of his proposed action. Has not this same conscience of his urged him to veto by his passive resistance the will of the Imperial Parliament, and is it likely to check him in his efforts to veto the choice of our City Council? No restraint availed to prevent his flouting the will of our local rulers, disturbing the peace of the city, and subjecting to indignity a worthy citizen. Being without sin he felt justified in casting the first stone. And what a stone! He threatened his fellow citizens with "an embittered controversy," and certainly he and his friends have made good his word. But plain men wonder how long bitterness has been a Christian product. "If a man have not the spirit of Christ," says the Bible, "he is none of His." Now the spirit of Christ does not exude bitterness.

# WHO ART THOU THAT JUDGEST ANOTHER?

Mr. Meyer, in attempting to justify his description of publicans as "bandits," enumerates some of the evil effects of intemperance, and proceeds to assume that all the blame thereof is to be laid at the door of the class he is attacking. What if we argued after the same fashion in regard to Christian ministers and Christianity? Shall we say that it is their duty to teach religion, and that they must answer for all the irreligion which prevails? Shall we turn to the records of history and note the bloody religious wars which have occurred among Christians—among them one of thirty years' duration and involving in its desolating scope a considerable part of Central Europe—the persecution of one religious body by another as each in turn got the upper hand—in particular the shocking treatment meted out by Christians to that ancient nation which gave them their Messiah and their sacred books. Where in all this is the charity, without which all religion is vain? How do the churches stand the test laid down by Christ? "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." Let John Wesley reply in his hymn on Primitive Christianity:—

"Ye different sects who all declare  
Lo, here is Christ, or Christ is there!  
Your stronger proofs divinely give  
And show us where the Christians live.  
Your claims, alas, ye cannot prove,  
Ye lack the genuine mark of love."

I am afraid the lines are not without application to-day.

## WHEN MINISTERS BEGIN TO DISCRIMINATE.

Religious teachers who resolutely refuse to distinguish between the brewer and those who abuse his products begin to discriminate when the enemies of Christianity draw up against it a long and heavy indictment of perse-

cutions, religious wars, hypocrisy, and crime recorded in the impartial pages of history. They commence talking of the distinction between the Church and the true genius of pure Christianity. They enlarge on the imperfection of human nature, even sanctified human nature. The heavenly treasure, they tell us, is "in earthen vessels." They dwell on the corrupting influence of unfavourable environment and the necessarily gradual evolution of events. But they cannot in common fairness employ these pleas in defence of a religion which from its heavenly origin might almost be expected to dispense with them, and at the same time deny the like consideration to men who only profess to follow a purely secular calling. If Christianity as Christianity is not to be blamed for the excesses and crimes of organised churches and of individual Christians, still less should the brewer or publican be blamed, not for their own excesses, but for the excesses of others. Just as the remedy in the one case is for all Christians to be true to the highest type of Christian character, so in the other department temperance is best promoted by encouraging all publicans to reach the standard attained by the best of their class. But a policy that tends to drive out the best men in a class is scarcely the way to improve that class.

### ARE WE NOT THE SALT OF THE EARTH?

The opponents of Mr. Holt, whatever other virtues they may possess, are not burdened with an excessive amount of modesty or self-restraint. They never weary of telling the world what wonderfully good men they are, and how multitudinous are their activities for the public good. Employing their familiar weapon of insinuation, they darkly hint that those who differ from them are at the best suspicious characters. Now and again they venture to express what they usually merely imply, as when Dr. Moulton and Professor Peake were held up to admiration in the Free Trade Hall demonstration, and were set against two "beer-laden sots" on the opposite side. The Pharisaic contrast was loudly applauded by

the gathering, but the words fell with sickening effect on the ears of at least one member of the audience.

Of course we cannot admit, what they seem to suggest, that all religious and philanthropic workers are on their side. Probably Canon Richardson (to take only one name out of those who did not support the agitation) has done more in the work of uplifting the poor and degraded than the best of them. He has been too much engrossed in his task to find much time for public vaunting of himself or platform denunciation of others.

It is not my wish to depreciate in the slightest degree the philanthropic work done by our protesting friends. All honour to them for it. But philanthropy is essentially the love of one's fellow creatures—of all of them, not of selected classes. Genuine philanthropic work is work inspired by this love of one's kind. Wholesale condemnation of brewers and publicans seems to me misanthropic work. I admire the philanthropy of our friends as far as it reaches, whilst regretting that the narrowness of its range leaves room for misanthropic feelings in their hearts towards certain sections of their fellow-men.

The essence of philanthropy is a heart of love, and love that objectifies itself in hate is not love at all. No amount of so-called philanthropic effort affords any guarantee of infallibility of judgment or justifies the condemnation of those who honestly arrive at a different conclusion. Christ Himself has taught us that men who in their self-estimate did much good in His name might be finally rejected as workers of iniquity. (Matt. vii., 22, 23.) "Many will say to me in that day 'Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy name? and in Thy name have cast out devils? and in Thy name done many wonderful works?' And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity."

Of like import are the words of St. Paul on charity, or love. (I. Cor. xiii., 13.) "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." So that the performance of external acts reputedly "chari-

table" does not necessarily imply the possession by the doer of the essential and internal affection of charity.

Let us advance to some of the succeeding verses in the same chapter, noting the practical exemplification afforded by the action of Mr. Holt's critics in the recent controversy. "Charity suffereth long and is kind"—hence the "embittered controversy" threatened at the commencement by Mr. Lewis, and all too accurately fulfilled by himself and his friends. "Charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up"—hence the extravagant self-laudation of our protesting friends. (Charity) "doth not behave itself unseemly"—hence the hustling, bullying tactics which led an able judge to denounce them as "bad citizens," and which Manchester so emphatically condemned at the November polls. (Charity) "thinketh no evil"—hence the readiness of Mr. Lewis to insinuate a charge of bribery against a man incapable of such an action. (Charity) "believeth all things"—hence the facility with which every bit of idle gossip tending to the discredit of Mr. Holt was greedily swallowed, as if "believing all things" meant believing all that is bad of a fellow creature. (Charity) "endureth all things"—hence the arrogance with which the minority refused to bow to the will of the majority, and, in disregard of all consideration for others, carried their protest to the extremest lengths.

In reading the bitter attacks made upon Mr. Holt one wonders whether the writers admit that brewers are, after all, their fellow-creatures. In the days of the Lancashire Cotton Famine some small supplies of the raw material were obtained from India, and that sent from Surat was the most indifferent in quality of a rather indifferent whole. It is related that a minister praying extemporaneously that Providence would send to our Lancashire port a large supply of the staple material, was interrupted by an operative member of his congregation, who groaned forth from his pew, "Yes, Lord, but not Surat." Similarly when our agitators are told that it is their duty to love all men, I can imagine their hearts, if not their voices, saying: "Yes, Lord, but not brewers."

## TAKE A SPECIMEN.

When I venture to recommend to our friends a little less harshness in judging others and a little more strictness in judging themselves, I scarcely expect my advice to be followed. Their self-complacency is proof against stronger attacks than mine, for has it not survived the crushing letters of Bishop Knox, Canon Richardson, and Mr. Chesterton? Time was when "if the brains were out the man would die," but experience shows that when the brains of sound reasoning are shown to be gone from a cause the ganglionic centres of prejudice, scorn, and obstinacy may suffice to maintain a sort of action on well-accustomed lines. But if the leaders of this agitation are impervious to reason and to fact, Manchester citizens are not in such a hopeless case, and it may lend these latter a little aid towards reaching a right decision if I place one of the champions of civic righteousness in the light of publicity in order to see how far he satisfies his own tests. If Free Church clerics are to be our new masters, it is important to know what manner of men they are. At the Free Trade Hall protest meeting the Rev. S. E. Keeble said that he spoke for several thousands of objectors in his capacity as president of the Manchester, Salford, and District Free Church Council Federation. The individual to whom I wish to call attention was a prominent member of the London Central Committee of the national organisation of that body, and a selected preacher at the annual meeting in 1906. He resembled the Rev. J. E. Roberts in being a Baptist minister, and shared with Mr. Robert Lewis the honour of being at once a teetotaler and passive resister. I might add that he was, and is, the personal friend of Dr. Clifford. Hence it can hardly be said that in choosing the object of my criticism I have selected an obscure or exceptional or unfair specimen. The name is the Rev. C. F. Aked, who was for several years minister of the Pembroke Baptist Church, Liverpool.

## A CHAMPION OF "RIGHTEOUSNESS."

My attention was first drawn to the Rev. C. F. Aked during the meetings of the Free Church National Council

at Birmingham in March, 1906, when, in referring to the then recent victory of their cause at the general election, he used the following words: "We have not won this victory without help. Mr. Balfour has helped us. The devil is sometimes our best friend." We do not wish to dwell on Mr. Aked's courtesy, or the want of it, so we pass to the sermon which he delivered as one of the selected preachers for the occasion. Speaking from the text, "Called to be saints," he made a rather striking declaration against the present competitive system of society. His words were: "Perhaps we have come to close quarters with the incarnate selfishness of the world, have seen the crushed, maimed, broken victims of a blind, insensate, blood-stained competitive system, and cried out in our agony of pity against man's inhumanity to man, which makes countless millions mourn." A few months after uttering these words Mr. Aked was preaching a sort of trial sermon in the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, New York, of which the most prominent member is Mr. Rockefeller, of Standard Oil notoriety, and an embodiment in an extreme form of the commercial system so vigorously denounced by Mr. Aked. The ministrations of their visitor must have proved acceptable to the Trust magnate and his fellow Baptists, for they shortly afterwards invited him to become their pastor. In response to what the "Morning Leader," in rather questionable taste, styled "Mr. Aked's Call—an order from God," the offer was accepted. No sense of the discrepancy between his past condemnation of the competitive social system and his future association with a multi-millionaire Trust magnate seems to have troubled Mr. Aked, or even to have occurred to him. In one of his last addresses to his church in Liverpool we find him telling his people that they had "lived and worked together for more than sixteen years, fighting side by side the battles of civic purity, national righteousness, and religious liberty." Although Mr. Aked has never referred to the question of salary as influencing his decision to go to America, yet a brother minister, in giving what a friendly paper ("The Christian World") calls a "breezy tribute" to him, puts the matter frankly

on a money basis. He congratulates Mr. Aked that he will not need now to pare his cheese nor look on two sides of a penny. "You are," he writes to Mr. Aked, "by nature large, expansive, flowing. Your habits tend constitutionally to methods of living which are expensive, even extravagant. You are attracted towards dash and speed and splendour. You hate the fellow in the motor because he handicaps you on your slower bicycle. You incline to breeze and mountain tops and champagne, and turn with loathing from humdrum and platitude and beer and shabbiness, and the vulgar way. . . . New York will give you all you want." If this "breezy tribute" passes for eulogy with Mr. Aked and the "Christian World," which was allowed to publish it, one can only wonder at their idea of eulogy.

#### FIGHT THE TRUSTS—OR—TAKE THEIR PAY?

Not long ago the Rev. F. B. Meyer, a brother Baptist minister, said that the "Church should fight the Trusts." Mr. Aked's way of fighting the Trusts is to accept the pay of a Trust magnate. When in England he regarded brewery money as tainted, and the public conscience of America is still more decided in condemning Trust methods and deprecating Trust gifts. A movement was even set on foot for boycotting those institutions which accepted financial aid from Mr. Rockefeller. Mr. Aked's conscience, though of the supersensitive kind, allows him to accept tainted money in America, after condemning it in England, and to ally himself with the Trusts which his friend Mr. Meyer said the Free Churches have to fight.

#### "NOT A FOOL, BUT A TOOL."

The sharp contrast between the Socialist principles with which Mr. Aked made some play in England and his association with a Trust magnate in America did not escape the notice of the "Socialist Standard." When people pestered Mr. Aked with begging letters because of his connection with a multi-millionaire, Mr. Aked rather impatiently asked, "Do they take me for a fool?" On this

the paper just mentioned comments: "Rockefeller did not take him for a fool, but for a tool. The Trust magnates can foresee the approaching struggle between the have-nots and the millionaire holders of aggregate capital. They will endeavour to delay it by every possible means. In this they will be assisted by advanced clergymen, who will accept the slaveholders' dollars to preach patience and peace to the wage slaves."

### THE WIDOW'S CRUSE OF OIL.

Without endorsing the full sweep of this indictment, one may very well wonder if Mr. Aked intends to stand in New York for that "righteousness" which he claims to have championed in Liverpool for sixteen years. Can he take the money of the Trust and be faithful to his ministrations to the Trust magnate? Certainly there are portions of the Bible which scarcely lend themselves to pulpit treatment at his hands in his new surroundings. It has been well said that Mr. Rockefeller's operations in oil have so raised the price of that commodity that every poor widow when she lights her lamp offers in that act "a burnt offering" to Mr. Rockefeller. We may be pretty certain, therefore, that Mr. Aked will never preach from the narrative in I. Kings xvii. 9-16, where the widow of Zarephath is represented as ministering to the needs of the prophet Elijah with a handful of meal and a little oil in a cruse, with the result that the barrel of meal did not waste nor the cruse of oil fail till showers of rain brought renewed plenty to the thirsty land. Far different is the modern version of that ancient story. Nowadays Mr. Rockefeller reduces the amount of oil in the widow's cruse, and Mr. Aked, misrepresenting the part of the prophet, so far from replenishing her scanty stock, ministers spiritual consolation to her despoiler. The story of Ahab coveting and seizing Naboth's vineyard will probably be taboo, suggesting as it does unpleasant reminders of the unscrupulous methods by which the Standard Oil Trust crushed out of existence its smaller rivals. And while Mr. Rockefeller behaved so much like Ahab, Mr. Aked acts so very unlike Elijah.

"THOU ART THE MAN."

Or, again, Nathan's parable in reproof of David's sin, in which he pictured a rich man "with exceeding many flocks and herds," robbing the poor man, his neighbour, of his single little ewe lamb in order to entertain there-with a guest, would scarcely be selected for pulpit treatment. Assuredly the contrast between the prophet Nathan bringing home his charge to David's conscience with his fearless denunciation "Thou art the man," and the modern preacher who shares with his patron the proceeds of social plunder would be too obvious to be pleasant.

ROCK(efeller) AND RIVERS OF OIL.

The old Puritan divines knew their Bible through and through, and were wonderfully apt in discovering texts suited to any and every person and circumstance. Had one of these worthies been asked to find a Scriptural passage which connected "Rockefeller" and "oil," he would possibly have referred the questioner to Job xxix., 6, which is not so very wide of the mark with the words, "The rock poured me out rivers of oil." But the texts selected by the Puritan preachers were not always complimentary. Perhaps they would have voiced the thought of myriads of poor Americans by flinging at the oil king's head the words of the parable of the ten virgins: "Give us of your oil, for our lamps are gone out." But Mr. Aked will be more diplomatic. We know, for he has told us himself, that he is no fool.

PASTOR OF A "PUBLIC MALEFACTOR."

Since Mr. Aked became associated with Mr. Rockefeller the President of the United States has denounced the Trust magnates as "public malefactors," and a court of law has condemned Mr. Rockefeller to a fine of over five millions sterling for illicit trade methods. Has Mr. Aked dissociated himself from this man? Has he, the "conscientious" passive resister of two years ago,

the preacher of "purity and righteousness for sixteen years in Liverpool," advised restitution? Has he in particular recommended his brother Baptists to restore the five millions with which this "public malefactor" endowed their university at Chicago? Nothing of the kind. Mr. Aked has indeed, in an address which an American paper characterised as "clerical buffoonery," poked fun at Mr. Pierpont Morgan, a millionaire indeed, but not Mr. Aked's millionaire. And now, much to his relief, as he tells us, he is taking steps to become a naturalised American citizen. I can assure him that the sense of relief will not be confined to his own breast.

#### THE FREE CHURCH FEDERATION LINKED WITH MR. AKED.

I have shown up the gross inconsistency of Mr. Aked, but the most remarkable feature of the case is that his friends in England seemed to be unconscious of any inconsistency on his part. No protest was raised to his appointment. There was a chorus, but it was one of congratulation. And in particular the Free Church Federation, for which Mr. Keeble spoke in the Free Trade Hall protest meeting, and with which the Rev. J. E. Roberts, Dr. J. H. Moulton, and Professor Peake (to name three leaders in the agitation against Mr. Holt) are connected, so far from condemning Mr. Aked's action, gave him a place on the official programme of their yearly gathering. The Free Church Federation set the stamp of their approval on Mr. Aked's nomination by inviting him to give an address at the communion service held in connection with their National Council. After Mr. Aked had associated himself with Mr. Rockefeller, the Free Church Federation associated itself with Mr. Aked, and through him with his millionaire patron. They sent him from the table of the Lord to minister spiritual consolation to the embodiment in its most extreme form of that competitive system which a few months before he had so vigorously denounced from their own pulpit.

## THE LINK BETWEEN MR. AKED AND MR. MEYER UNBROKEN.

The Lancashire papers of October 24th, 1907, contained a report of the recognition meeting held to welcome Mr. Aked's successor in the pastorate of Pembroke Chapel, Liverpool. The Rev. F. B. Meyer, of "bandit" fame, was present, and made a complimentary reference to Mr. Aked, from whom a congratulatory telegram was received and read at the meeting. Hence we may infer that Mr. Meyer still sees no inconsistency between his exhortation to the churches to "fight the Trusts" and acceptance of the pay of Trust magnates. Mr. Meyer accuses publicans of being bandits, yet the Baptist denomination, to which he belongs, accepted five millions from one of the Trust bandits. The receiver is as bad as the thief.

### NOT ALL CHRISTIANS SO PHARISAIC.

Dr. Gladden, speaking at the Triennial Council of Congregationalists at Cleveland, Ohio, preached to the churches self-examination rather than the condemnation of others. After referring, among other bad signs of the times in America, to the tendency to the accumulation of power in the hands of a few and the tendency to use this power predaciously, he proceeded: "The church has gathered into her communion many of the most conspicuous of the perpetrators of these injustices—they are nearly all church members—and has made herself a pensioner upon their bounty." Dr. Gladden is evidently more inclined to hear the church exclaim "God be merciful to me a sinner," than to hear her say, in self-righteous accents, "Lord, I thank Thee that I am not as other men are, or even as this publican." And this, we submit, is the correct attitude for Christians on this side the Atlantic. At any rate, our study of Mr. Aked will, I hope, have sufficed to show that the rule of Free Church clerics of his type would mean the tyranny of men, at once inconsistent and intolerant. We shall at a later stage examine the action of some of his brethren nearer Manchester. At present we return to the main argument.

## WHAT THE AGITATION IMPLIES.

Those who endeavour to ascertain the principles which underlie this agitation will see that what is constantly assumed, but never proved, is that the consumption of the brewer's products is essentially wrong, irrespective of the moderation or otherwise of the individual consumer. As the taking of drink is held to be an absolute evil, and as such to be condemned, so, too, the brewing and selling of drink are deemed immoral ministries to an immoral act. The total cessation of the manufacture, sale, and consumption of drink, and, as a means to that end, its prohibition by law, are implied. Now these views, which are on this side of the Atlantic mere unwarranted assumptions, are the accepted doctrine of some of the American States. Kansas, as Dr. Sheldon has told us, is one of those regions. In that State, brewing is a crime in the eyes of the law, and brewers are regarded and treated as criminals. It seems to me as factitious to make a criminal of the brewer as it would be to make one of the tobacconist; but, however that may be, no one can say that the Kansas people are inconsistent with themselves. From Kansas premises they draw Kansas conclusions. Do our local agitators act with similar consistency by drawing English conclusions from English premisses? Not at all. Living in a country where more than three-fourths of the people think it right to take drink, they ask the drinkers who create the brewer to gird at the brewer they create. This is to make mock of common justice and common fairness. You may grow Kansas fruit on the Kansas tree, or English fruit on the English tree; but not Kansas fruit on the English tree. That would be a contradiction in the nature of things.

## WHAT CONSISTENCY REQUIRES.

The Christians who lead this agitation must be consistent, and purge their churches of all complicity in a traffic which, they tell us, is accountable for so much misery and sin. A brewer is, on their theory, an open

and notorious sinner. If so, let him be treated as such, and excluded from the church, just as professional thieves would be. So, too, no publican could become a church member. The money of brewers and publicans is tainted, and must not be accepted for Christian purposes. To a member of either of these classes who offers financial aid, the church must reply: "Thy money perish with thee." As drinking, like theft, is an absolute evil, no drinker, however "moderate," can be admitted to membership any more than can a thief. Indeed, the word "moderate" does not apply. We might as well speak of a "moderate thief." Drinking and thieving are alike essentially bad, and no terms can be made with either.

Such are the consequences which flow from the assumptions made by our friends. If the Free Churches admit drinkers to their membership, if they accept (as they nearly all do) the contributions of drinkers and brewers, they are infected with the taint they denounce, and must first cast the beam out of their own eye before they seek to extract the mote from the eyes of others. Those who judge their fellows should first judge themselves, and only start to cleanse society when their own hands are clean.

### GLASS AND PIPE.

Members of the Salvation Army are required to abstain both from intoxicants and tobacco. Teetotal opinion in the Free Churches has made teetotalism an almost essential feature in a minister's qualifications for office; but the opponents of tobacco have not yet succeeded in extinguishing the minister's pipe. Most of them are smokers, some of them rather heavy ones. They take no drink-offering to the shrine of Bacchus, but they present a copious burnt-offering at another altar. Alcohol the poison is banned, nicotine the poison is adored. Not all the deplorable effects of juvenile smoking suffice to prevent their setting an example to the rising generation which, on teetotal principles, is most reprehensible. Will they be consistent with the rules they lay down in this controversy, surrender their beloved pipes, ban the

tobacconist, and protest that no tobacconist must ever be Mayor of Manchester? Not so; they will stick to their pipes, and "out of the same mouth will proceed blessing and cursing"—blessing for the tobacconist and cursing for the brewer. According to them, when Old King Cole called for his glass he was a very bad man, but when "he called for his pipe" he was only doing what certain exceedingly good men do, and so was in that respect free from blame. One penalty of erecting factitious standards is that they cannot be honestly applied all round. Those who state principles in view of a particular case are at a loss when an opponent makes an application of their own rule in a sphere where they find consistency inconvenient. When confronted with the contradiction involved, they must either conscientiously adjust their conduct to their rule or cast discredit on the rule and on themselves by allowing party interests to govern the application of principles. In this case our friends will probably choose the latter course. They will go on puffing at home and abroad, and in their clerical conferences, after passing resolutions against the opium trade, will rush off to enjoy their particular opiate in the smoke room, which is a necessary adjunct of such gatherings.

### THE SLAVE TRADE ARGUMENT.

The argument in favour of brewer persecution based on a rising ethical standard has been already answered in its general form, but a particular case of it—that based on the slave trade—has been advanced in this controversy. We are told that just as the national conscience at one time tolerated the slave trade and slave-holding, but afterwards came to see the iniquity of the whole thing, so the present objection to the drink traffic and to brewer-mayors is a mark of growth in the national conscience. Let us consider this plea a little more particularly. In the first place, we note that the drink trade can be traced back over a thousand years in the national history, whilst the slave trade was of comparatively brief duration. In the second place, fully three-fourths of the nation still

see no harm in consuming drink, and the proportion was still greater in times past, whilst the number of slave traders and slave owners was a small fraction of the nation, and many of the latter were not resident in England. In the third place, drinking went on in this country, but slave-holding was not allowed here. In the fourth place, large national revenue was, and is, drawn from the liquor traffic; not so with the slave trade. In the fifth place, the national conscience has never sweepingly condemned the liquor traffic as a whole, but the national conscience did feel the continuance of the slave trade to be unendurable. Be it noted that although on all the five points just enumerated the complicity of the nation in the slave trade was only fractional as compared with the fuller degree in which it has been, and is, involved in the liquor traffic, yet in the case of the slave trade when the national conscience was stirred there ensued a national recognition of national complicity therein. There was no attempt to lay the sins of a people on a scapegoat class and punish a section for what was felt to be more or less the fault of all. Our modern teetotalers act very differently. Ignoring history and defying justice, they hold the present generation of brewers responsible for the history of English drinking hundreds of years before they were born. When slave owning was brought to a close, the nation compensated the owners to the extent of twenty millions of public money. The United Kingdom Alliance seeks to close public-houses without compensation. Lastly, although the wealth of Liverpool had been largely built up on the slave trade, and many respectable families were implicated therein, neither Liverpool as a city nor Liverpool citizens connected with the condemned trade were punished by public reprobation. As the modern theory of conscience which believes it right to be virtuous at other people's expense had not been developed, so the mean attempt to use social boycott and civic disability as weapons of attack against individuals was not then devised. The Gladstone family, for example, was largely involved, and the first speech Mr. Gladstone made in the House of Commons was in

favour of better terms for slave owners. Yet Mr. Gladstone's political opponents made no attempt to exclude him from high station on this plea. By their magnanimous silence on the subject they allowed his connection with the trade to drop into oblivion. I have often wondered whether the Liberal party would have displayed a like reticence if Mr. Balfour and his family had been similarly involved. The shabby treatment meted out by our protesting friends to Mr. Holt suggests the answer to this question.

### THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SNARE OF TEETOTALISM.

The radical mistake of militant teetotalism is connected with a well-known fact of mind—the tendency to allow the means selected for the attainment of an end to absorb the interest to such a pitch as to throw the original end into the background and lead to action resulting rather in its detriment than in its furtherance. It is, in short, the sacrifice of ends to means. The secondary comes to rank before the primary, the servant rises to be the master of his former master. Let me illustrate by the case of the miser. Now, no man deliberately sets out to be a miser. That is the point at which he finally arrives, but it is not the end at which he first aimed. No, the mental picture which he set before himself at the outset was the possession of sufficient means to secure comfort in his old age. That was the end at which he aimed. But the attainment of that end demanded the employment of certain means, and these means were acquisition and the restriction of personal expenditure. But as time went on the habit and love of acquisition grew upon him, and he pinched himself more and more in order to augment his rate of saving. The increase of his hoard, which was originally merely a means to his future comfort, became an end in itself. In the pursuit of this substituted end the miser sacrifices the very comfort which he started to secure. What was to begin with merely the road to a goal becomes the goal, and present self-denial, which was intended at some future time to

give place to comfort, is continued when the very idea of comfort has vanished from his mental horizon. Writers on mental science call this psychological tendency the transference of interest by association.

### JONAH AN ILLUSTRATION.

The best of men are not exempt from this human frailty. We will take our second example from the Bible. Jonah, prophet of the Lord, was sent to the people of Nineveh to warn them that for their sins the city would be overthrown in forty days. The people, repenting of their wrong-doing, turned from their evil ways. God saw their repentance, and remitted the threatened punishment. Jonah would surely rejoice at such a happy issue of his mission? Nothing of the kind. Starting as the bearer of God's warning message, he had come to identify himself, the messenger, with the literal fulfilment of his dreadful message. The end, the repentance of the people and their forgiveness as a result of Jonah's mission, was lost in the care of Jonah for his precious reputation as a prophet. The personal element was introduced, and a poor, weak man set his hard and unforgiving temper against the mercies of a forgiving God. In his vexation the prophet asked that he might die. A city which contained one hundred and thirty thousand children, too young to distinguish their right hand from their left, must perish rather than he should seem to suffer some slight personal discredit. But God rebuked His servant and taught him how unlovely and inhuman were the feelings into which self-love had betrayed his heart.

Is there not a certain resemblance between the case of Jonah and the leaders in this agitation? Jonah was personally one of the best of men, for was he not a chosen prophet of the Lord? The Citizens' Committee are among the best of men, for they have repeatedly told us so. As to that point they do not quote testimonials or give references; they simply write out their own characters. We humbly accept these self estimates, and start by pointing out that there is the similarity of high personal character

between the case of Jonah and that of the Citizens' Committee. But high character did not save Jonah from assuming an attitude of mind to his fellow-creatures of Nineveh which was harsh and inhuman. Neither are the members of the Citizens' Committee exempt from the like frailty. When Jonah did not get his own way he was very angry, and when certain members of the committee did not get their way they were very angry. Jonah in his wrath refused to remain in the city, saying, "I do well to be angry." Dr. Moulton and Principal Graham, speaking in the name of the Citizens' Committee at the Free Trade Hall demonstration, declared a boycott on the Town Hall during Mr. Holt's mayoralty. Like Jonah, they withdraw from the city; like him, they do well to be angry. The harsh temper of Jonah received the rebuke of God, the harsh temper voiced by Messrs. Moulton and Graham has incurred the censure of the people of Manchester. Shall we say "*Vox populi, vox Dei*"?

#### THE LOGICAL CONFUSION.

The transference of interest by association which has just been referred to and illustrated by the cases of the miser and the prophet Jonah is the fruitful parent of much that is questionable in the action of teetotal extremists. Let us take one instance. A certain number of men, moved by a genuine horror of drunkenness, form a society called the United Kingdom Alliance, with the aim of opposing intemperance. This is their original end. But this organisation once formed and certain measures being advocated by it, devotion to the organisation and loyal support of its measures are held to be essential. The means—fidelity to the Alliance—comes to override the end, the abatement of intemperance, as was evident in the case of Mr. Bruce's Licensing Bill of over thirty years ago. Under that bill of Mr. Gladstone's Government licenses would by this time have been reduced to half their present number, but the proposal was wrecked, and mainly through the opposition of the United Kingdom Alliance. The late Dr. R. Martin, of Manchester, more

than once stated that by that action alone the Alliance had done more harm to the cause of true temperance than it had done good in other ways throughout its existence.

How fallible are our friends was strikingly shown in the recent division in their ranks on the point of what is called "disinterested management." The advocates of that measure were lovers of temperance quite as much as were the members of the Alliance; yet this body opposed the scheme because its provisions clashed with those of their particular nostrum. The advocates of disinterested management complained that by this opposition it was proved that fidelity to the Alliance and its measures weighed more with Alliance men than the abatement of drunkenness. Certainly both sides could not be right; yet the division in opinion of the two parties did not seem to shake the confidence of Alliance men in their organisation.

Allied with the psychological confusion which has been pretty freely illustrated, there often occurs what I may call the logical confusion—the inability or unwillingness to distinguish between the occasion and the cause, between the folly within a man and its external manifestations—between merely local association and causal connection. In the struggle between legislative repression and private folly the power of the former is limited. It is no gain to suppress the manifestation of human weakness if we thereby drive the mischief inwards and so provoke more disastrous forms of expression. There is no justice in saying that because the publican stands at a point where human nature breaks down therefore he is the cause of the lapse, always provided he does not seek to provoke that lapse. Local association as a class must not be construed into actual causation as a class. The causal connection can only be justly attributed to those individual cases where intemperate drinking is personally encouraged. Such men should be made to feel the weight of public opinion, but the wholesale condemnation of a class is as absurd as it is unjust. The depraved inclination of men, if deprived by external repression of one vent, is apt to find another and possibly worse one. When men use wild and whirling words about the amount of crime to be set down to the

account of beer drinking, they would do well to ask what will take the place of the beer displaced. Will the spark in the drunkard's throat be quenched by shutting up the public-house? Will the inner craving cease as if by magio to please the United Kingdom Alliance? Will local veto prove a veto on human imperfection? And if not, a wise man will look at both sides of the account and ask whether what takes the place of beer drinking may not prove worse than beer drinking itself. If intemperate men passed from beer to morphia, brewers would be ruined indeed, but, at the same time, the nation would advance a long way on the road to ruin.

In all this I am not protesting against opposition to drunkenness (a vice which I deplore as much as any man), but against putting all the blame of it on one class, and that not the one that commits it, and also against quack remedies which mistake the symptom for the disease, and in their action prove worse than the disease. If the drink evil is the cause of nearly all the crime in England one would expect that Constantinople, where the drink evil does not exist, would be one of the most moral of cities. That such is not the case everybody knows. The recent great increase in lunacy is often assigned to the consumption of drink as the cause. But, if drinking were the sole cause, or even the largest factor, we should see some sort of correspondence between the statistics of drinking and of lunacy. They would tend to vary in the same direction, increasing or decreasing together. What is the fact? During the seven years in which this great increase of lunacy has occurred the consumption of drink has gone down by twenty millions a year, in spite of an augmenting population. So that we have the marvellous phenomenon of a weakening cause producing a stronger effect. This kind of reasoning may pass muster in band of hope recitations and on Alliance platforms, but in works on logic it is only discussed in the chapter on fallacies.

A doctor in lunacy recently declared that the children of drunkards are drunkards or lunatics or criminals. This in an official report! Has this gentleman lived in a cupboard that he makes assertions so far from the truth? Is

his statement true of the rich and titled classes? We know it is not. Is it true of the middle and working classes? On the contrary, the revulsion of feeling which occurs in the mind of some children of drunkards drives them to the other extreme. Such random talk reminds me of a little anecdote. A good brother in a village prayer meeting was much given to expatiating on his extreme wickedness, telling the Lord that he was a guilty worm and the chief of sinners. A sister, who had often chafed to hear what she thought his undue self-depreciation, could not contain herself on one occasion when the tale of sinfulness was being told for the hundredth time. She broke in upon the good man's confession of his exceeding sinfulness with the exclamation, "Thank God, that's a lie!" So when a doctor in lunacy gravely tells us that the children of drunkards are drunkards or lunatics or criminals, we may thank Heaven that the statement is not true to fact.

Perhaps the real explanation of this official's strange statement is that he meant to reverse his proposition, and say that drunkards, lunatics, and criminals are frequently the children of drunkards. This may be true, but it differs from his original statement by substituting "frequently" for an implied "always," and by turning the proposition right about. Just as it is false to say, "All Europeans are Frenchmen," but true to say that "All Frenchmen are Europeans," so it is certainly incorrect to say that the children of drunkards are drunkards or lunatics or criminals, but it may be not very far from the truth to assert that drunkards and lunatics and criminals are frequently the children of drunkards. If this conjectural emendation of the doctor's statement is not the correct one, there is only one other explanation of it left. He must have asked one of the lunatics under his care to write that paragraph in his report.

### **"CONFUSION WORSE CONFOUNDED."**

What passes for argument among teetotalers is frequently a blend of what I have called the psychological confusion with the logical confusion just named. Let us

give a specimen of their confused reasoning. They often argue, not explicitly, but implicitly, something like this:

1. There is no drinking without a certain amount of drunkenness.
2. Drunkenness is mischievous and immoral.
3. Therefore the public sale of drink is wrong, and to be discouraged or even suppressed.
4. And the brewer and publican follow an immoral occupation.
5. Therefore publicans and brewers should be subjected to disabilities.

Of these five statements the first two are true. In the third the false assumption is made that what contains an objectionable element must be condemned wholesale. What class or what institution would escape under this rule? In the fourth sentence the blame for the immorality of the drunkard is transferred to publicans and brewers associated with it. In the fifth the blame put upon the class descends to every individual member of the class, and is held to justify disabilities at the hands of their fellow citizens.

To show up the injustice of this reasoning, let us apply it to the case of preaching in places of Christian worship:

1. In connection with all Christian preaching and worship there is a certain amount of formalism, hypocrisy, and sectarian hatred.
2. These feelings and habits of mind are bad.
3. Therefore public worship and preaching are wrong, and to be discouraged or suppressed.
4. And ministers follow an immoral occupation.
5. Therefore ministers of religion should be subjected to disabilities.

Of course this is sheer nonsense, but so is the one on which it is modelled. Common sense and common justice suggest that the proportion of hypocrisy, more or less, which is incidental to all churches, is due to the imperfection of human nature, and for it ministers of religion are

only responsible in so far as they encourage it. Equally is it true that drunkenness is due to the imperfection of human nature, and for it publicans are only responsible in so far as they encourage it.

### DISINTERESTEDNESS NOT SUFFICIENT.

Teetotalers tell us that in their agitation they are perfectly disinterested. We gladly admit that they have no mercenary aims, and that their desire is to benefit their kind; but good intentions do not guarantee the adoption of means suitable to the attainment of the desired end. History shows that an altruistic bias may mislead nearly as much as a mercenary one. The self-approbation arising from the consciousness of disinterested motive is sometimes carried forward, as it were, to the practical means employed, and held to justify them. In the words of Dick Dauntless in "Ruddigore": "It must be right so long as your 'eart be your compass, in so fur as this 'ere 'eart of mine's a dictatin' to me like anythink." But experience shows that emotional impulse is blind, and is apt to strike out wildly. Warm hearts require cool heads to guide them. An impulse imperfectly rationalised may be the spring of mischievous action.

A further risk of mistake arises when an organisation is formed to promote a certain object. Party loyalty presents its demands, which may not coincide with the original and professed aim, while the tendency to oppose at all costs the persons and classes which are obnoxious to the favoured organisation comes in to pervert the love of justice and right for its own sake. The words of Sir Henry Thompson are worth quoting on this point: "Moreover an exclusive and sectarian spirit always creeps in sooner or later wherever an 'ism' of any kind leads the way, which brings in its train assertions barely supported by fact, the equivocal use of terms, evasion—in short, untruthfulness unintended and unperceived by the well-meaning people who, having adopted the 'ism,' at last suffer quite unconsciously from obscurity of vision, and are in danger of becoming blind partisans." These

words present a perfect picture of the particular "ism" called teetotalism in its aggressive aspect.

### THEIR ABUSE OF LANGUAGE.

When in the Civil Wars the Parliamentary party styled themselves the "Godly" and attached to the Royalists the odious name of "Malignants," they endeavoured to beg the whole matter in dispute by taking to themselves an honourable name and fastening on their opponents a dishonourable one. In somewhat the same manner some total abstiners make play with the words "temperate" and "temperance," which they seek to appropriate to their own side. I say most, not all, for the Church of England Temperance Society, with greater breadth of spirit and accuracy of language, admits all who aim at temperance in act whether total abstiners or moderate drinkers. But the majority of so-called Temperance Societies are simply total abstinence organisations. The members of these bodies speak of their propaganda as "temperance work" and themselves as "temperance workers." Is this use of those phrases justified? If a man made no use of his eyes whatever we should scarcely say that he was "temperate" in the use of his eyes; so a man who makes no use of drink whatever can scarcely be described as being "temperate" in regard to drink. Perhaps it will be replied that there is a proper use for eyes, and that, in their opinion, there is no proper use for drink. Just so, but people who hold that drink is so thoroughly bad as not to be susceptible of any proper use are bound to be total abstiners from it, not "temperate" users of it. In the same way they think that theft is bad, and recommend total abstinence from theft. Why do they not speak of "temperance" in theft? Because they feel that there is a clash in the words. Those who, with the majority of Englishmen, believe that a moderate use of drink is neither a practical impossibility nor a contradiction in terms may legitimately speak of temperance in the use of drink, but those who say no man can exercise temperance in the matter

can scarcely call their work "temperance" work. There are millions of Englishmen who have never lost their moral self-control in the matter of drink consumption. What are these men? They are not total abstainers, they are not drunkards. They are temperate men, for the retention of one's moral self-control is of the very essence of temperance.

When a flexible rod is twisted out of the right line, it may be necessary to give it a twist in the opposite direction that it may ultimately settle in the medium position. In the same way teetotalism may be advisable in cases of drunkenness as an extreme recoil from that phase. Again, when good men sign the pledge in order to encourage drunkards to take that step, their conduct is beyond praise. The mischief begins when they are not content that their own consciences should regulate their own conduct. If they seek tyrannically to impose on other men what the latter conscientiously reject, they are persecutors in fact and act, whatever they may say to the contrary. Men of conscience should make it a matter of conscience to respect conscience in others.

#### AN ELEVENTH COMMANDMENT.

Teetotalers, taking for doctrines the commandments of men, make of their particular "ism" a sort of eleventh commandment. When this is done the man-made rule is sometimes found to be out of harmony with the God-given commandments, with the result that the will of men overrides to some extent the law of God. There is grave peril in the passionate exaltation of one particular tendency. Extravagant stress laid on one department of conduct causes other and more vital departments to suffer from comparative neglect. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink," says the Bible. Christian teaching emphasises the supreme importance of the right spirit within a man and the comparative unimportance of external matters and material observances. The militant teetotalers, on the contrary, lay stress on an external matter. They glorify a mere means: they treat instru-

mental and secondary matters as of primary importance, and this at the expense of more fundamental truths. In the time of Jesus those who thrust into the foreground minor matters, such as the payment of tithes on mint and anise and cumin, thrust into the background the weightier matters of the law. The history of Christianity affords only too many illustrations of the like mistake. We will give one instance. It is a fact that in the days when slavery prevailed in the United States it sometimes occurred that at one and the same church meeting resolutions were passed condemning dancing as sinful and approving slave-holding as right. The conscience of to-day, both religious and secular, has reversed this judgment. Our local agitators follow the example of the Christian slave-holders pretty closely. They condemn moderate drinking and approve the class persecution of brewers. I believe that Manchester reverses both decisions.

#### RISE AND GROWTH OF AN INTOLERANT SPIRIT.

Having adopted for themselves the practice of total abstinence as the appropriate weapon with which to fight drunkenness, teetotalers are tempted to condemn all those who decline to follow the same course. During one of my stays at a Matlock hydro an ardent teetotaler told me, in the presence of some other visitors, that I was "worse than a drunkard." I replied: "Then I should be a better man if I became a drunkard." This rather staggered him, and he modified his original statement into "Your example is worse than that of a drunkard because the sight of a drunkard tends to repel from drink, but your example would rather lead others to think it safe and right to use it moderately." My answer was: "I do think it right to drink in strict moderation, and when you assume it is not you take for granted the very point in dispute. As for the responsibility of example, a man's influence is generally held to tell in the direction of his own practice, not in the opposite direction. If on your theory the example of the drunkard tells towards total abstinence, surely that is an argument in its favour—which is absurd." Of course I

failed to convince him, and when he had reasserted his opinions he took out his pipe and smoked away contentedly, for he was a rather heavy smoker. The next day our group was joined by a newcomer who was as much opposed to tobacco as he was to drink. The conversation of the previous day came up for review, and our latest arrival strongly backed the views of his fellow teetotaler, much to the latter's satisfaction. But when his pipe was produced at the close of the argument, as it had been the day before, he received such a lecture from the anti-nicotine man as he had himself given us the day before on the drink question. The mischief of juvenile smoking—the responsibility of example—the blameworthiness of professed moderation—the tendency of the smoking habit to generate, or at least encourage, the drink habit—all these were enlarged upon with the usual teetotal vehemence and exaggeration. We others listened in amused silence to see our friend's guns thus turned on his own position. The fact is that the teetotal principle, from the nature of things, cannot be applied all round.

The recent dispute between the friends of "disinterested management" and the supporters of the United Kingdom Alliance was most illuminating. Mr Arthur Sherwell, writing in the "Methodist Recorder" for November 8th, 1906, says: "What is it in the temperance movement that destroys in so many ardent reformers the sense of proportion, and—I am afraid I must sorrowfully add—ordinary respect for accuracy of statement. I

believe that the United Kingdom Alliance has done itself and its cause needless injury by exceeding the limits of its own policy and constitution, and by going out of its way to express formal condemnation of a principle which until quite recently it was not unwilling to sanction.

If people before stigmatising our proposals would only take the trouble to read them, they would save themselves from a confusion which is injurious to their own reputations and unfair to others." He expresses his regret that "even intelligent and sincere men indulge in wild statements," and says: "Do let us, as earnest and practical temperance reformers, put away unreason-

ing prejudice and unnecessary misconceptions, and face facts." It is evident from these words that the bitter intolerance of the Alliance has disgusted some teetotalers. What effect the unedifying spectacle has had on the general public may be easily guessed.

#### MR. LLOYD-GEORGE INFECTED.

The President of the Board of Trade is a very able man, who possesses in a high degree the art of accommodating himself to his audience. Put him before a meeting of his fellow Welshmen, and he suits his address to their tastes and prejudices; set him among business men and he will display a high capacity for business; assign him the task of engineering a practical proposal through the House of Commons and he will win high credit by his power of adapting himself to the demands of the situation. Place the same man on the platform of the United Kingdom Alliance, and what will he do? How will he display his opinion of his audience? If the action of the President of the Board of Trade on the occasion of his recent visit to Manchester is any criterion, we may say that he considered exaggerated language and inaccurate figures to be the intellectual food expected from him, for that was what he supplied to them. He said that "the Government must first of all put an end to the mischievous operations of the great recruiting sergeant of the unemployed army—drink—with his press-gang of public-houses." It is deplorable when a responsible Minister of the Crown talks such silly clap-trap. Mr. Lloyd-George is too clever a man not to know that this Government will not, and indeed cannot, put an end to licensed houses. Mr. Arthur Sherwell, in the letter already quoted, says that Sir Wilfrid Lawson himself considered that a reduction of fifty per cent in the national drink bill was scarcely to be expected in this generation or the next. As for the "press-gang" phrase, it is ridiculously inappropriate, though admirably fitted to the taste of an Alliance audience. The pressed sailor was seized and carried off by external force against his will, whereas no man is compelled by external force to enter a public-

house. The one was involuntary, the other is voluntary. The one was a denial of free choice, the other a permission of free choice. When publicans sally forth into the street at the head of armed bands, carry off passers by into their places of business, then and there compel them to purchase and consume what drink their captors choose, then, and not till then, will it be possible to talk about the "press-gang of public-houses," without indulging in language which is both injuriously insulting to a respectable trade and an utter perversion of fact. The essence of the press-gang was its interference with a man's free choice. If there is a press-gang in this matter it will be found among Mr. Lloyd-George's audience, for their fingers itch to force men out of public-houses, and convey them bodily to meetings which the religious and philanthropic press-gang consider more suitable for their captives. Doubtless they think it would be well for those who enter public-houses if they were carried off to a band of hope gathering, or a mothers' meeting, or one of those assemblies we see described by their promoters as "brief and bright and brotherly," which the late Dr. Parker said might as well be styled "meek and mild and motherly."

The President of the Board of Trade was not content with presenting to his Alliance audience the appropriate diet of language false to fact; he also fed them with figures false to fact. He stated that from 25 to 75 per cent of workmen failed to present themselves at their places of employment on Monday morning. And this from the President of the Board of Trade! The next day he reduced the percentage to one between five and 25—a remarkable fall, and suggestive of grave reflections. Inquiries made in Manchester and Birmingham showed that even this was an absurd over-statement. To name one particular instance: of the 607 men employed at the Cape Hill Brewery, Birmingham, the percentage of absentees was a little under two and one-third. Among Mr. Lloyd-George's audience there must have been many business men who not only knew that that gentleman's figures were absurdly untrue, but whose office boys would have heard them with a smile of amused contempt. That

such men should tacitly approve false figures constitutes a painful problem. Do they think that the end justifies the means, and that lies serve as a suitable foundation for what they consider the truth? Canon Hicks has in the course of this controversy spoken with contempt of "the moral code of his (Mr. Holt's) business." Those agitators who put forward false descriptions and falsified statistics in the promotion of a favourite cause should search their own consciences and bring "the moral code of their business" to the test of the eternal verities.

The fortunes of any cause are to some extent in the hands of its advocates. Bad management may spoil even a good case. What is the effect produced on the minds of the general public when they see that the men who wish to reform them employ questionable means in the prosecution of their campaign? What can it be except to reflect discredit on themselves and their cause, and throw public sympathy on the side of the class that is unworthily assailed? It is strange that agitators, who admit that the coming licensing legislation, to be successful, must win the approval of the general public, should by tactics void of principle alienate the great mass of unprejudiced men who are neither interested in the drink trade on the one hand nor violently hostile to it on the other.

#### FESTINALENTE.

The tendency of extremists is to be dissatisfied with the slow progress of moral evolution and to turn to what they call "drastic" legislation as a remedy for moral ills. "The mills of God grind slowly," too slowly for the patience of these hustlers according-to-law. Legislation, especially coercive legislation, is the modern fetish. Does anything objectionable occur? Immediately the man in the street cries out: "There ought to be a law passed to prevent it." But the scope of legislation is limited. In the words of Goldsmith:—

"How small of all that human hearts endure,  
That part which laws or kings can cause or cure!  
Still to ourselves in every place consigned,  
Our own felicity we make or find."

I never read the second of the above lines without thinking that the possibilities for mischief of unjust laws is much greater than the possibilities for good of just ones.

We cannot entirely save fools from their folly by external regulation. Men are not to be treated like babes. It is impossible to put a guard round every fire as if the world were a nursery with our teetotal friends as grandmotherly caretakers and officious dictators. An enforced mechanical sobriety would be dearly purchased at the cost of freedom.

#### OTHER TEETOTALISMS ABANDONED.

Fifty or sixty years ago the Nonconformist churches taught that cards, dancing, theatres, and novels were of the devil. Where are those teetotalisms now? There are still families which, narrowly good, still cling to the old standards on these points, but these are a small and diminishing minority. The heads of Nonconformist families arrange whist drives and give dancing parties, while the career of Sir Henry Irving and the moral support afforded to him by the Baroness Burdett-Coutts have helped on the tendency to remove the ban from the theatre. As to novels, a work by R. L. Stevenson was recently recited at the charge of a shilling a head in the church of one of those who spoke at the Free Trade Hall demonstration. The Rev. Silas Hocking, formerly a prominent Nonconformist minister, has found the call to novel-writing more influential than his prior call to the ministry. So do merely conventional standards fade and pass. Having no root in eternal principle they cannot abide.

Has the passing of these four teetotalisms no lesson for our friends? May not the teetotal theory as to drink, which has waxed as the other teetotalisms have waned, be destined to follow them to extinction? Like them, it may prove to be merely conventional and therefore merely temporary.

## FOLLY AND ITS MANIFESTATIONS.

He is a poor physician who cannot distinguish between a disease and its manifestations. It is of the essence of quackery to strike at a symptom to the neglect of the root-malady. If the expression of human folly in one form is checked too rigorously it is apt to find other and perhaps more objectionable outlets. Constantly increasing pressure is put upon public-houses, and the result is that drinkers organise clubs, which are much less under control. The Chief Constable of Manchester recently mentioned the case of a club which he had raided, of which any female could be a member on the payment of twopence a week, and any man for threepence weekly. He went on to say: "He trusted the Government would at the same time consider the question of the clubs. He knew from practical experience that the clubs were chiefly the cause of the sin of drunkenness. Last year between twelve o'clock at night and six o'clock in the morning 1,375 persons were arrested for drunkenness in Manchester. The publicans could not be blamed for that. There was no doubt that they got the drink either in the clubs or private houses, and he did not think many people got drunk in private houses after twelve o'clock at night."

## "HELPS" THAT ARE NO HELP.

When Mr. Gladstone introduced grocers' licenses, he meant to help sobriety, not hinder it. His intention was to remove to some extent the necessity for entering a public-house. We all know how mischievous the Act proved in its operation. Only among women is drinking on the increase at the present time, and the growth of the drink habit in this section of the community is universally admitted to be largely due to a well-intentioned Act passed by a great Liberal statesman who was personally one of the best of men. Legislation remedial in its intention aggravated the mischief it was meant to check. If it lessened drinking in the public-house it increased it in the private house, and that among the mothers of the people.

Another doubtful remedy is Sunday closing. A Glasgow gentleman, formerly a resident in Oldham, tells me that Sunday closing means in Glasgow the purchase of drink on Saturday night for consumption on Sunday in the home, and that in this consumption wives and children frequently take their part. They often drink till all the liquor is gone, with the result that on Sunday night and early Monday morning numerous arrests for drunkenness are made. As by that time the public houses have been closed for twenty-four hours or more, these street scenes cannot be laid at their door. Moreover, the practice of shebeening is resorted to as an evasion of the law, as the record of convictions for that offence proves. The Glasgow authorities have pursued the questionable policy of dehumanising the public-house as much as possible. Barmaids are not allowed, and the provision of sitting accommodation is discouraged. My informant tells me that in practice these well-intentioned rules work out in sharp and frequent drinking at the public bars. Men who under wiser rules would slowly consume a moderate amount at one place of refreshment call in quick succession at several places for drink. Dr. Sheldon himself, on leaving for America, said that Glasgow was much more drunken than London. The experience of Sweden, as well as that of Wales and Scotland, seems to afford conclusive evidence that at any rate beyond a certain point restrictions on the sale of alcoholic beverages increase rather than diminish drunkenness.

The report of the Chief Constable for Glasgow confirms this view. In 1905 no less than 14,309 persons (18·3 per thousand of the population) were apprehended for drunkenness, this being an increase on both 1903 and 1904. Last year the number rose to 19,334 (or 24·2 of the population). The prevalence of shebeening may be gathered from the facts that 97 persons were prosecuted for shebeening and hawking excisable liquors in the streets, as compared with 70 in 1905, and that 107 persons were apprehended for being drunk or drinking in shebeens, as compared with 76 in 1905. It is evident, therefore, that stringent restrictions which we saw to be questionable in theory have at

Glasgow failed in practice. A "reform" that results in increased drunkenness is no reform.

Teetotalers are apt to ascribe the decline in the national drink bill to the increase in their number and the influence on legislation exercised by their class. They forget three things. Firstly, that the practice of moderation started with the upper classes and after reaching the middle section is now affecting the working classes. Secondly, that in other countries where there is little teetotalism and no compulsory closing hour a similar improvement has taken place. In Germany, for example, drunkenness is rarer than in England, yet the legislative restrictions in force are less onerous than in this country. Thirdly, the intolerant tone of the militant teetotalers has done much to check sobriety and estrange the public from their movement, so that the service they have rendered to temperance has been partly negated by a certain amount of disservice.

The anti-brewer agitation in Manchester seems to me part and parcel of the political movement against Mr. Balfour's legislation. Mr. Robert Lewis, as passive resister, has sought to wreck that statesman's Education Act, and as a teetotal agitator he clamours for the reversal of the Licensing Act. I shall deal with Mr. Lewis as a passive resister in a subsequent chapter. With regard to the Licensing Act, I will quote a remark made by Mr. C. P. Scott, a witness who will not be suspected of Balfourian leanings. Speaking at a dinner given in his honour in Manchester, he said that the Licensing Act of 1904 contained two good features in that it brought the ante '69 beerhouses within the purview of the justices, and also placed the conditions under which new licenses are granted in their hands. We may add to this handsome admission that it made possible a steady reduction of licenses without drawing on the public purse. But because the Act involved the recognition of a title to compensation, it is odious to the Alliance and its friends. Under the old system, with a theoretical power to refuse all licenses, the humanity of the justices largely prevented the closure of public-houses except on grounds of misconduct in their

management, whereas the present method allows justices to study the requirements of a district and close surplus houses without feeling that they are robbing respectable men of a living. "By their fruits ye shall know them." If the practical result of Mr. Balfour's Act is to reduce licenses at a fairly rapid rate, why this fanatical desire to reverse it? Just as passive resistance by its law-breaking methods tends to make all law a nullity, so this proposed reversal of legislation strikes a blow at the continuity of legal enactment. And the marvel of marvels is that men like Mr. Lewis, who aim at reforming the country by means of laws, should show us by their passive resistance agitation how the laws they desire may when passed be brought to nought, and by their "reversal" policy how their favourite enactments may in their turn be reversed when the opposite party comes into power. Their policy might be summed up in the words, "How the friends of 'progress' make continuous progress difficult, if not impossible." How much their cause has suffered in the past by narrowness on the part of teetotalers is beginning to be seen by some of themselves. At a demonstration in Derby, Mr. C. Clements, J.P., speaking as a teetotaler to teetotalers, said that "he looked forward to the time when broadness of mind would be commoner amongst their own ranks. He was of opinion that they had lost greatly in the past by being too exclusive" ("Temperance Bells" for October, 1906). May this more tolerant and reasonable spirit grow and spread until it reaches his brethren in Manchester.

Having now discussed the question on the ground of general principle, we pass to our second chapter—some of the parties involved in the controversy

## CHAPTER II.

---

### SOME OF THE PARTIES INVOLVED.

---

#### PASSIVE RESISTERS.

The close connection which exists between the passive resistance movement and the opposition to Mr. Hall has struck many observers. Mr. Charles Hughes spoke of the anti-brewer agitators as "Canon Hicks and the passive resisters." Another correspondent called them "the old gang of passive resisters in a new guise." Change "gang" into "band," and the description may stand. Take some of the more prominent names. To begin with, Mr. Robert Lewis, who started the agitation, and accurately reflects its tone and spirit, is also a leading passive resister. Does not his name stand high on their roll of martyrs with eight commitments to prison, the last of the eight being for the lengthy period of one day? The Rev. J. E. Roberts is a leader in both crusades. Mr. R. D. Darbishire combines the same two characters. The Rev. S. F. Collier, of the Central Hall, has lent his countenance to both programmes, even going so far on one occasion as to have the platform at the Central Hall got up in stage fashion to represent a prison cell for passive resisters—an appropriately theatrical exposition of an essentially theatrical agitation. Professor Peake, who spoke at the Free Trade Hall meeting, belongs to the Primitive Methodist body, a denomination which at its annual conferences has passed unanimous resolutions in favour of passive resistance. The Rev. J. Hirst Hollowell is a violent partisan in both causes. Dr. J. H. Moulton is in sympathy with passive resisters and also anti-brewer agitators. The energetic group of

applauding Didsbury students, who by their presence in the Free Trade Hall helped to eke out a somewhat meagre platform, and by their action did so much to keep the protest meeting alive, belong to an institution in which a branch of the Passive Resistance League was started by the students very early in the movement. More instances might be added in illustration of the close connection between the two agitations, but I will only name one. The Rev. S. E. Keeble, who took part in the Free Trade Hall meeting, stated that in opposing Mr. Holt he was speaking for four thousand members of the Manchester and District Free Church Federation, of which he was president.

#### THE FREE CHURCH COUNCIL.

This name brings us round to the Free Church Council and its association with both passive resistance and the present agitation. The connection is pretty obvious. Dr. Clifford is the leading spirit of the passive resistance movement, and a prominent member of the National Free Church Council, for the Manchester branch of which Mr. Keeble spoke at the Free Trade Hall meeting. The Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, who encouraged the anti-brewer agitation and advised his protesting friends to go out into the streets of Manchester and canvass, is an ex-president of the Free Church Council. In their Year Book for 1906 I find among the members of the General Committee of that body such familiar names as the Revs. J. S. Lidgett, S. F. Collier, J. H. Hollowell, J. E. Roberts, and Professor Peake, all committed to both agitations. As the Council by its political and civic activities figures so largely before the public eye it is important to examine its credentials.

#### WHOM DOES THE FREE CHURCH COUNCIL REPRESENT?

The Council frequently acts as if it represented all the Free Churches outside the Anglican and Roman communions, and Dr. Clifford, with characteristic exaggeration, has in so many words claimed for it that position. The very title, "Evangelical Free Churches," might have taught him that his society only professes to represent a

section of the Free Churches. As a matter of fact, Unitarians are excluded from association. The question arises: Does the Council represent the other non-established Churches? If any one man has the right by high position, devoted service, and ripe wisdom to speak on such a matter, so far as the Congregational body is concerned, that man is Dr. Guinness Rogers. Writing to the *Times*, January 11th, 1907, Dr. Rogers said: "The Free Church Federation represents its own members, but not any of our great bodies, such as the Wesleyan Conference or the Congregational Union." The statement passed unchallenged. But if the Council has no warrant for superseding the representative authority of the Congregational Union, neither has it any warrant for elbowing out of its corporate position the Baptist Union. As a matter of fact, the Free Church Council came into being not by the action of representatives duly appointed by the constituted authorities of the various Free Churches, but by the coming together of groups of individual members of those Churches, who assume to represent the Churches of which they are individual items. Out of these groups the National Council is ultimately formed, which pretends to speak not for the groups to which it owes its existence, but for the whole of the Churches in which these groups are found. A somewhat similar performance has been witnessed in Manchester quite recently. A number of individual citizens met together for purposes of agitation and appointed a committee to carry out their will. This body met at the Central Hall, dubbed itself the Citizens' Committee, and attempted to dictate to the members of the City Council—the true Citizens' Committee. The constitution of the Free Church Council and the action of the Citizens' Committee equally rest on a negation of the true principles of representation. It is an oligarchy masquerading as democracy.

But let us probe still further the claim put forward by Dr. Clifford, when, in the *Times* of December 11th, 1906, he spoke of the National Free Church Council "representing the whole of the Free Churches." With regard to the largest non-established religious body in England—

the Wesleyan Methodist Church—it is easy to prove that the assumed representative character of the Free Church Council does not hold, for in the *Methodist Recorder* (March 7th, 1907) the Rev. Samuel Chadwick complained that the attitude of his fellow Wesleyans “has on the whole been one of aloofness, if not positive distrust.” He admits that the Free Church Council is “believed by many to be a political caucus, fighting under an ecclesiastical banner,” and finally asks if it is “wise, just, or Christian for Wesleyan Methodists to stand aloof.” The *Methodist Recorder*, in reply, said: “Is it not desirable that there should still be a Nonconformist Communion in which a Conservative politician may conveniently worship? Would it be wise to drive all Wesleyan Conservative politicians into the Church of England?” Here, then, we have clear proof that members of the largest Free Church in the country on the whole stand aloof. Let us consider a few of the strange results to which we are committed if we allow that the Free Church Council represents the whole of the Free Churches. If the Free Church Council arrives at any decision that decision represents the will of each of the component Churches. If, for example, the Free Church Council decided for secular education (and the President declared that if the Government proposed such a measure, a vote in opposition could probably not be carried in the Council), while the Wesleyans are, as a matter of fact, strongly in favour of religious education, we should have the remarkable spectacle of the Wesleyan body being at once for and against secular education.

Take another case, which would be possible, and, indeed, might easily arise in practice. A deputation, consisting of Free Churchmen, is being received by a Minister of the Crown. The Chairman of the Congregational Union speaks for the Congregationalists, the Chairman of the Baptist Union for the Baptists, the President of the Wesleyan Conference for the Wesleyan Methodists, and the President of the Primitive Methodist Conference for the Primitive Methodists. Then the President of the Free Church Council rises to express the views of the religious bodies he represents—the whole of the Free Churches!

Would he dare to say explicitly what his Council claims implicitly, and tell the Cabinet Minister that the presence of the previous speakers was quite unnecessary, that his commission superseded theirs, because he represented the whole of which they only represented the fractions? We have seen that Dr. Clifford speaks of the National Council as "representing the whole of the Free Churches," but even he would scarcely have the courage to make this practical deduction from his doctrine. General statements that will not stand the test of practical application stand condemned.

The more the representative character of the Free Church Council is investigated the less satisfactory is it seen to be. First they take a part of the Free Churches as organised bodies, next a part of the membership of these bodies. This part of a part is then held to be the whole. There is no proper foundation to their scheme of representation. The Free Church Council is like a figure with head of brass but feet of clay.

Against the claim of Dr. Clifford that the Free Church Council represents "the whole of the Free Churches," let me set the words of a local Free Churchman, Mr. John Broxap, who, in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian*, said that "it has never claimed to be representative of all Nonconformists." Mr. Broxap has not followed the utterances of his leaders on the Free Church National Council. The paragraph of Mr. Broxap's letter from which I have quoted is worth giving in full. It confirms, in language of admirable clearness, my present argument. Speaking of the Free Church Council, he says: "I wish to explain that it is a voluntary association of the members of certain Nonconformist communities, amongst which are the various Methodist bodies, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Bible Christians, and others not named. It has never claimed to be representative of all Nonconformists, nor does it include all the members of the various churches included in it, nor has it claimed to have any official sanction from the authorities of these churches. It is, as already stated, a voluntary association of individual

members who come together for mutual action and defence."

The time I have spent on the question of the representative character of the Free Church Council will not be lost if the result is a juster estimate of the exaggerated claims that have been made for it in the past. A body which takes action in local and national affairs by virtue of its supposed representative character must submit to have its credentials tested. Some light is thrown on the point by the case of the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett. That minister was a year or two ago unanimously elected President of the Free Church Council. To be so chosen as the head of a body "which represents the whole of the Free Churches" might well be deemed the summit of a minister's ambition. As the whole is more than its part, as the greater surpasses the less, one would scarcely expect that the quondam occupant of so giddy a height would condescend to stand as a candidate for an inferior post—the headship of merely one of the constituent churches over which in their collective capacity he had previously ruled. Yet last year the same gentleman was chosen President-designate of the Wesleyan Conference by probably one of the narrowest majorities on record. He only polled seven votes more than the second name on the list, and had to his credit less than half the total number of votes cast in the election. That Mr. Lidgett should accept what, on Dr. Clifford's theory, is the minor post, shows that he does not believe in that theory sufficiently to let it determine his practice; while the fact that he was unanimously elected to the presumably higher position, but only scraped into the other by a majority suggestive of the second ballot, proves that the mind of the Wesleyan Conference is by no means in accord with that of the Free Church Council.

These facts are, of course, familiar to Dr. Clifford, yet in face of them he maintains that the Free Church Council represents "the whole of the Free Churches." Euclid lays it down as an axiom that the whole is greater than its part, but in this case Dr. Clifford would have us believe that the part is equal to the whole. But the very

name of part implies that there is another portion or part which, together with the first part, constitutes the whole. The question arises, Of these two parts of the Free Churches which is it that is equal to the whole? The answer obviously is that the part of which Dr. Clifford is a part is not a part, but the whole. In the matter of representation the Free Churchmen inside the Free Church Council perform on their brethren outside an operation similar to that of Pharaoh's seven lean kine on the seven fat ones. Perhaps when the former ate up the latter they might in a sense be said to represent externally that of which they had disposed internally, but Dr. Clifford's mode of procedure is to ignore as Free Churchmen those Nonconformists whose misfortune it is to stand outside the Free Church Council.

It is evident therefore that the claim of the Free Church Council to speak for the whole of the Free Churches is not in harmony with facts. Such a claim should never have been made by men who knew it to be unfounded. That men of "conscience" should sail under false colours suggests reflections as to the quality of the conscience.

#### THE FREE CHURCH COUNCIL HAS A POLITICAL SIDE.

It is the glory of the Church of England that when you say "Churchman" you do not necessarily say either Liberal or Conservative. The same formerly held good of Wesleyan Methodists, and to a less extent applies to-day. But when you say "Baptist" or "Congregationalist" or "Primitive Methodist" you may usually add "Liberal." These Churches are almost narrowed to the bounds of one political party. They take their religion and their politics in one and the same parcel. Now, it is from the three religious bodies just named that the active spirits of the Free Church Council are drawn, as, for example, the Baptist Dr. Clifford, the Congregationalist Rev. J. H. Hollowell, and the Primitive Methodist Rev. A. T. Guttery. That portion of the Wesleyan Methodists who have joined the Council are on the whole strongly Liberal in politics. We may name as a specimen the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, who published a leading article in the *Methodist Times*,

headed "Christianity and Liberalism," the gist of which was that Liberalism was Christianity in the political sphere. The same paper published a leader on the London County Council election in March last, headed "Loot v. Love." The side represented by "Love" was, of course, the Rev. J. S. Lidgett's friends, the Liberals; the party of public plunder was those wicked Municipal Reformers who differed from him.

The Free Church Council mainly consists of Congregationalists, Liberals almost to a man, led by such men as the Rev. J. Hirst Hollowell, and the Rev. Silvester Horne—Baptists, also exclusively Liberal, under the leadership of Dr. Clifford—Primitive Methodists, Liberal through and through, with Professor Peake and the Rev. A. T. Guttery to the front—combined with a sprinkling of Wesleyans dominated by a Liberal M.P., in the person of Mr. Perks, and the Rev. J. S. Lidgett, editor of a Wesleyan paper, which treats Liberalism as the political side of Christianity. What wonder if such men, even though coming together in the first instance mainly from a desire for united religious action, should be drawn into political courses by the sense of their common Liberalism? Such, in fact, was the result. Their similarity of view on Parliamentary questions worked out into political co-operation in one direction and in favour of one party—the Liberal party. Those who are conversant with the facts of the case will need no proof of this statement, but for the sake of any who have not closely followed the political action of the Free Church Council, I will adduce a little illustrative evidence drawn from the Free Church Year Book for 1906. We are told (p. 184) that so far back as 1903 "the National Council deemed it necessary to open an election fund to provide the sinews of war for the conflict." Mr. Geo. Cadbury and others are named as "prominent helpers" of the election fund. A "Free Church Manifesto" was issued prior to the General Election, and an "Election Campaign" was arranged. This included a "motor campaign," in which the Rev. F. B. Meyer and a colleague took the western counties and Kent, Dr. Clifford and another made a tour of the eastern counties, whilst

the Rev. Silvester Horne toured through the South-west Midlands. In the report from Manchester, forwarded by the Rev. J. Kirk Maconachie, similar partisan action is reported (p. 196). Millions of leaflets were distributed, all pointing in one direction politically, and some of them marked by a decided anti-Anglican bias. Here are a few of the titles—"Mr. Balfour's Illusions." "The Clerical Cuckoo," "Why Free Churchmen are against the Government," "The Bishop of London's Great Hoax," etc. Enough has been said to show the close connection which exists between the passive resistance movement, the anti-brewer agitation, the Free Church Council, and Liberal politics. It is true that Dr. Moulton has denied that the present agitation has anything to do with politics, but the very next letter to his own, in the correspondence columns of the *Guardian*, was an appeal from the Rev. J. H. Hughes to Welshmen to support the agitation in order to help Mr. Lloyd George and the present Government in view of the coming Licensing legislation. Alderman Holt was to be deprived of a portion of his civic rights, the will of the Manchester City Council was to be flouted, and the course of municipal government deranged in order to facilitate the progress of a political measure. So narrow and partisan were the aims of the Citizens' Committee.

## TWO PERSECUTING MOVEMENTS.

What is the fundamental similarity between the passive resistance and the anti-brewer movements which caused them to be so frequently combined in the same person? What impels Mr. Robert Lewis, for example, to be a leader in both agitations! The answer is, I think, that each movement is a product and expression of the persecuting spirit. In the one case it leads to the denial of fair treatment to a brewer from a feeling of trade hostility, in the other it leads to the denial of fair treatment to denominationalists in education from a feeling of religious hostility. In each case the principal leaders are members of the "Free" Churches, who never weary themselves but often weary others by telling the world of the struggles of their fathers in the cause of liberty. I have shown

that in the Commonwealth period, when the spiritual ancestors of modern Free Churchmen enjoyed an ascendancy, maintained at the point of the sword, they could and did persecute with the best, even prohibiting the use of the Prayer Book in private families. When their militarist supremacy disappeared, and they passed from agents to victims of persecution, there was no special merit in struggling for freedom—the freedom they had denied to others in the days of their power. “Your ancestors persecuted mine,” says the modern Dissenter to the modern Churchman. The Churchman might (but seldom does) retort, “And yours persecuted mine.” The magnanimous silence of Churchmen as to their sufferings for their religion, and the diligent publication by Dissenters of theirs, produces an entirely false impression on the public mind, which is fed on half truths—ever the worst of lies. The suppression of one feature and the exaggeration of another results in a caricature, not a true likeness. The Nonconformist treatment of history does not reflect credit on the Nonconformist conscience. It is too partial and selective to be true. Hence it becomes possible for men like Mr. W. T. Stead to declare on the platform of the Free Church National Council that the Church of England “had not a glimmer of an idea of its duties to the nation.” Shame on the man who could utter so vile a slander, and shame too on the Free Church Council who gave it their endorsement by publishing the words in the official record of their proceedings.

But this fling was not enough for Mr. Stead. After bad history came, appropriately enough, bad manners. The official record of the Free Church Council reports his next sentence in these words: “The Bishop of Birmingham had lost a great opportunity when he omitted to invite the National Council to the Cathedral for a great ‘Te Deum.’” Words like these, in which silliness and bitterness struggle for the mastery, reflect discredit only on the speaker and his friends. The Church of England is not merely expected when smitten on one cheek to offer the other also, but to lend its Cathedral for a “Te Deum” in honour of the smiters.

The Free Church Council did not know what Mr. Stead was about to say, but they incurred full responsibility for his utterances by publishing them in the official record. If their platform speakers are not confined to the ranks of gentlemen they might at least employ one in editing their Year Book for the press. If the secretary, the Rev. Thomas Law, is the actual editor, one reads with a smile the estimate of the Rev. C. F. Aked, who is reported as saying, "God was very good to give them Mr. Law, and he desired to say that they loved him and were proud of him." This touch of combined patronage of the Almighty and of Mr. Law is quite in the Aked vein.

I have dwelt on this incident because it illustrates two forms of persecution to which the Church of England is much exposed to-day—the persecution arising from perverted history, and the persecution of slanderous speech. For, after all, the point for the men of to-day is not what the spiritual ancestors of Churchmen did to the forefathers of Dissenters ages ago or *vice versâ*. What each party should ask itself is, Do I cherish that hard, unchristian temper of which persecution in some form or other is the inevitable outcome? It seems to me that while the Church of England has largely learned the lesson of charity and toleration, many modern Dissenters linger in the persecuting stage of evolution.

#### PASSIVE RESISTANCE A PERSECUTING FORCE.

It may be worth while to dwell a little on the proofs of the assertion that passive resistance is a persecuting force. Take first a few utterances of passive resisters.

1. A lady resister compared the position in which she was placed in having to choose between payment and non-payment of the Education rate to that of the martyr-maiden in the famous picture, "Diana or Christ." Her soul, she said, was in peril. Even assuming (what, in view of their own special contributions, is not admitted by the other side to be the fact) that the payment demanded would be spent in propagating a religion somewhat different from her own, does it show a Christian spirit to liken the religious teaching of fellow-Christians to the idolatrous worship of a heathen goddess?

2. At the foundation-stone laying of a new Wesleyan Chapel in Rotherham, the Rev. N. Fysh, a leading passive resister, who had been invited as a brother Nonconformist minister to be present, on being called upon to pray, uttered, among other petitions, the following: "Lord, grind the High Church party to powder."

3. A Mr. Luke, who once figured largely in Free Church gatherings, and who was referred to as a typical passive resister by Dr. Clifford, in his speech at the passive resistance meeting in Manchester, said when in prison that he had "skinned" his opponents when he had been liberated before, and that when he left prison that time he would "skin them again." He added that the magistrates had given him a longer sentence than was usual, because he had objected to children being beaten for refusing to learn the Church Catechism. Doubting his ability to read the minds of the magistrates, I wrote for information to the place indicated. I was told, in reply, that the true facts would be laid before the public, and shortly afterwards the school correspondent stated in the columns of the *Christian World* that no children had been beaten, and gave the full history of the case. No reply was made to this letter by Mr. Luke or anyone else, but the "skinning" gentleman ceased to figure on the martyr roll of the passive resisters. It did not tend to raise my opinion of Dr. Clifford's candour to hear him read all Mr. Luke's outburst except the "skinning" sentences. Those unchristian words should have altogether prevented a Christian minister from using his testimony. Is no stick too dirty when beating the Church of England is the business in hand? Do not Nonconformist methods of controversy come within the purview of the Nonconformist Conscience?

4. Perhaps it will be said that these are individual utterances. Unfortunately, they reproduce only too accurately the passive resistance spirit. Let us, however, give an extract from an article in a representative paper, the *British Congregationalist*. In its issue for June 20th, 1907, appears an article, signed William Pierce, in which the writer gives his "meditation in Northampton Gaol."

After saying that he goes "with clenched teeth" to his penalty, and speaking of the Church of England as the Hagarene Church, he proceeds to say that the Archbishop of Canterbury "wants  $x$  millions for his own Hagarene Schools" and "his own Hagarene Colleges." Falling foul of the Liberal party, who are accused by him of using passive resisters in their political game, he says: "Here we be penned up in bishops' prisons like milch kine, to supply the fighting energy to the mercenary hosts who fight the progressive battle, but have themselves no conscience in the matter." This precious article, so full of unconscious self-revelation, winds up with a hint of personal violence to the bishops. Here are the words: "I wonder if there would be much satisfaction to a prisoner, lately discharged, to stand at the barricade and shoot at a batch of retreating bishops. I am afraid I have never given my 'old Adam' a chance of using lethal weapons, scarce even to know the difference between one end of a gun and the other. But if the fury of a democratic uprising came upon us, I would not trust my 'old Adam' with a sword if a gaitered bishop were standing by. The old one would surely cut his ear off."

If Mr. Pierce is a fair specimen of the modern Nonconformist he represents a sad falling off since the time of John Bunyan. *He* did not attain a fabricated martyrdom by passing down the shady lane of "No effects" towards a few days' residence in a prison, which was at once the gaol of his body and the goal of his mind. Though he probably spent more days in prison than all our modern passive resisters put together, his simple soul was too full of Christian charity to harbour thoughts of pride and hate. Lying down in his prison at Bedford he saw visions and dreamed dreams far different from those of William Pierce in Northampton Gaol.

5. Dr. Robertson Nicoll, editor of the *British Weekly*, is rightly regarded as one of the ablest and most influential leaders in the passive resistance movement. Does Lord Loreburn, the Chancellor of England, displease Dr. Nicoll by creating new Liberal magistrates at too slow a rate? He cannot protest with decency, but becomes

personal and offensive. He contrasts the "Bob" Reid of former days and the Lord Loreburn of to-day, suggests that having attained position by professing certain principles he is now no longer true to them, and compares him to Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in Stevenson's well-known novel. In one instance the *British Weekly* speaks of "the home counties, which Lord Loreburn is quietly handing away to the enemy as fast as he can." The article concludes with the following: "Liberalism at the present time has no more active, deadly, and powerful enemy than Lord Chancellor Loreburn, who climbed to his present position on the shoulders of Radicals." Bad goes before, but worse remains behind. Dr. Nicoll attacks Lord Loreburn because when sitting in his judicial capacity he gave in the West Riding appeal case a decision unacceptable to Dr. Nicoll and his friends in the West Riding. This man of conscience appears in his true light as a would-be forcer of conscience, one who, in order to secure a partisan triumph, would fain poison the fountains of justice and corrupt the highest judiciary in the realm. To attain his ends judges must break their solemn oaths and turn the "Courts of Justice" into halls of injustice. No wonder that passive resisters have an uneasy feeling that the leaders of their cause have in their blindness brought them to the edge of the ditch. Let me return upon Dr. Nicoll the advice given by him to the *Church Times* in December last, when he suggested repentance in tears and ashes as a most appropriate act.

#### DR. LEACH AS A SPECIMEN.

The character of passive resistance may be read in the character of passive resisters. Mr. Birrell has told us that the theological bacillus bred in chapels is quite as noxious as that bred in churches. This admission is all the more to be noted because Nonconformists in general have never developed that fine capacity for belittling their own church to which a few Anglican dignitaries have attained. Let us then try the art of moral vivisection on some leading passive resisters in order that we may, if possible, isolate the passive resistance bacillus.

Dr. Leach, shortly before leaving Manchester, threw a flood of light on his own idea of free discussion of the education question. He magnanimously invited any group of opponents to provide for him a room and an audience, and he would undertake to enlighten them on certain specified points in dispute. Mr. T. C. Horsfall offered to provide room and audience for Dr. Leach on condition that he was allowed to follow the doctor and present his side of the argument. To this Dr. Leach would not agree. This Free Churchman's idea of free discussion was that only one side should be heard, and that, of course, his own. The party, whose guest he was, must listen in meek silence to the lecture of their visitor, and not presume to express their own views on their own premises. Suppose an Anglican clergyman had offered to enlighten a group of Dr. Leach's friends in Dr. Leach's schoolroom on condition that the Free Churchmen he addressed were virtually gagged, one can imagine the terms of abuse with which so unreasonable and one-sided a proposal would have been received.

The incident in itself is trivial in the extreme; it is merely a straw flying in the wind. But though the flight of a straw is a small thing in itself, yet it may serve to indicate the quarter from which the wind blows. In the same way the above incident, however trifling it may seem, gathers importance if it indicates that the prevailing wind in Dr. Leach's spirit is from the quarter of intolerance. For intolerance it is when a man will not tolerate a reply to his arguments from those who have listened on their own ground to his presentation of his own case.

Just before leaving Manchester Dr. Leach made a particularly cantankerous speech when appearing before the Court as a passive resister. The trustees of his Church and schools let their Sunday School premises to the Manchester Education Authority for use as a Board day school at a rent which is, of course, paid out of the rates. The trustees of denominational schools give the use of their school buildings to the public free of charge. The man whose co-religionists charge a rent to the rates holds,

strangely enough, that the people who do not make a charge are taking advantage of him for the maintenance of the teaching given in their schools. Denominationalists charge no rent for their schools, and yet pay their full education rate. Dr. Leach charges rent, and declines to pay his full education rate. When pastor of a church the trustees of which have received over two thousand pounds from the public rates, he haggles over a miserable shilling or two in the Court, and would have us believe that his small contribution goes towards the teaching of denominational doctrine.

#### DR. MASSIE.

The way in which a passive resister's conscience allows him to act on other questions sometimes throws an illuminating sidelight on passive resistance itself and the spirit from which his action springs. This is notably the fact in the case of Dr. John Massie. If there is a promise that should be made with deliberation and redeemed with fidelity it is a promise made by candidates for Parliament. Yet Dr. Massie, in a letter to the *Times*, spoke of such promises as being made "lightly and casually," as if that were quite the normal way of giving what ought to be a solemn and deliberate pledge. Not much trace of a super-sensitive conscience is visible in such language. Some of Dr. Massie's friends were like-minded with himself, for they called keeping their word "a mere pedantic regard for theoretic consistency," and stated that "though they were pledged they were not bound to give effect to their undertaking at an inopportune moment."

In connection with the admission of women to membership of the Executive of the National Liberal Federation, Dr. Massie was guilty of what the *Manchester Guardian* called a "thoroughly illiberal" action. It had been the custom to leave the admission of women to the Council an open question; at any rate, they were not expressly excluded until Dr. Massie moved and succeeded in carrying a resolution to that effect. When the Liberal ladies and their friends "conscientiously" protested Dr. Massie forgot his passive resistance theories, and spoke of physical

force as the last word in the question. In a thoroughly characteristic phrase he remarked that "it would be time enough to elect women on the Council of the Federation when they had votes." Obviously the passive resister's conscience may contain a large element of cynicism. When women had obtained the vote, and with it political power, Dr. Massie would be quite willing to utilise them for party purposes, but in the meantime their conscientious efforts to attain sexual equality would receive no aid from this conscientious friend of equality. In the words of the *Manchester Guardian*: "Hitherto there has been no actual disability; he (Dr. Massie) has inflicted one. As there was no disability, there was no slight; he has inflicted one."

Mr. Hollowell protested in the *Manchester Guardian* that passive resisters "have nothing more to do with Dr. Massie's motion than they have to do with the speeches of M. Jaurès in the French Chamber," and suggested that it would be equally fair to judge passive resistance by "his views of the probable duration of the solar system." I leave it for ~~say~~ readers to say whether the connection of Dr. Massie's action with passive resistance is quite so remote as Mr. Hollowell would have us believe. A religious political leader, who is guilty of "thoroughly illiberal" action, in one department shows that he is actuated to some extent by the spirit of intolerance, and it is fair to ask whether his activities in other spheres may not be prompted by this same spirit.

At the autumnal meeting of the Congregational Union in Blackpool in 1907, Dr. Massie spoke of himself as favouring "the secular solution" of the day school religious question. He said that there was "the secular thorough" on the one hand, and "the denominational thorough" on the other. But, said Dr. Massie, if Mr. Balfour could drive them to the advocacy of purely secular education he would sweep the country at the next election. Hence this man of conscience puts his conscientious preference for secular education in his pocket, and deliberately proceeds to make the religious education of six millions of English children a mere pawn in his party game.

Conscience and conviction give way to policy and tactics. Between "the secular thorough" and "the denominational thorough" Dr. Massie, driven by sectarian exigency, proceeds to discover what he oddly enough calls "the Cowper-Temple thorough." What plain men would call a compromise he dubs "thorough." After the perversion of principle the perversion of language. And Dr. Massie would contravene the fundamental principle of passive resistance by forcing his compromising "thorough" on millions who conscientiously reject it.

At the spring meeting of the Congregational Union in 1907 some discussion arose about the inconsistency of their receiving rate aid towards their own denominational secondary schools whilst protesting against rate aid to denominational elementary schools. But it is one thing for Congregationalists to state principles and lay down rules to the detriment of alien churches, and quite another thing to apply their own rules to their own case. Feeling probably that inconvenient adherence to principle was a matter which might very well wait, the discussion of the subject was postponed to the autumnal session of the Union. Was this implied pledge honourably redeemed? Scarcely, for the subject was relegated to the bottom of the programme as if consistency on a vital principle were a comparatively trifling matter, and was then treated not by the Union but in the form of a "Conference." Some speakers, Mr. Shepherd, of the London County Council, among them, were in favour of continuing to receive the grants for their secondary schools, but Mr. Hollowell told them that to do so would be "giving away their case" in elementary education. Thereupon some declaration was made against their acceptance, and Dr. Massie explained, in conclusion, that the resolution did not bind the Union. Thus the discussion by the Union, which had been distinctly promised six months before, was evaded, while Dr. Massie's closing words seem to suggest that Congregationalists do not owe to the opinion of a mere "conference" that respect which would be due to the decision of the Congregational Union. All this suggests a conscience in a somewhat rudimentary stage of development.

## REV J. HIRST HOLLOWELL

When Mr. G. K. Chesterton, in his brilliant letters on the Mayoralty question, exposed the two classes of intolerant persons into which the opponents of Mr. Holt may be divided, he playfully dubbed one class the Tories and the other the Moslems. I for one was not surprised when he instanced the Rev. J. Hirst Hollowell as enjoying the distinction of combining the two intolerances in his sole person. We in Manchester have had ample opportunities of estimating his tone and spirit from the speeches and letters in which he has expressed his views on public questions. He enjoys great advantages as a propagandist. As an ex-Congregational minister he figures at the meetings of the Congregational Union, as a member of the Free Church National Council he is a prominent speaker at their reunions, and as paid secretary of the Northern Counties' Education League his letters follow one another in close succession in the newspaper press. Even some of his own friends dub him an extremist on the education question. His opponents consider him a very able but somewhat unfair controversialist. Mr. Horsfall, in his "Letter to a Nonconformist," writes:—

"The Northern Counties' Education League, which has a large number of members, including many of the best-known Nonconformist ministers in this part of England, several years ago appointed the Rev. J. Hirst Hollowell to be its paid secretary. Mr. Hollowell has ever since his appointment made unjustifiable charges against the managers of denominational schools, especially against clergymen of the Church of England. Whilst acting as secretary of the League, he supplied a quantity of detail to a charge made by a Nonconformist minister against a clergyman of causing a child to be sent from the top to the bottom of a class in a Church of England school for refusing to become a member of the Church choir—a charge which was afterwards admitted by the minister who made it to be unfounded; and at a meeting of the Liberation Society at Rochdale he allowed the audience to believe that a Roman Catholic Church at Castleton, near

Rochdale, against which a charge of allowing alcohol to be raffled for was made at the meeting, belonged to the Church of England."

Mr. Hollowell is difficult to please on the education question. Of course, Mr. Balfour's Act was anathema, but Mr. Birrell's bill was not much more acceptable to him. He belittled Mr. McKenna's proposals, and repudiated the suggestions of the Nonconformist members of Parliament. At the Midland Hotel meeting of the Northern Counties' Education League he spoke in my hearing of the "apostasy" of the Government in the matter of Mr. Birrell's bill, and advised them to "try the superb tactics of honesty." But is Mr. Hollowell entitled to lecture the Government on honesty? As a passive resister he holds that no one should be compelled to contribute to the cost of religious teaching to which he conscientiously objects. Since there is no form of religious teaching which does not clash with one's conscientious views, the doctrine assumes as its necessary basis a purely secular system of national education. But in October last Mr. Hollowell explained to a wondering world when secular is not secular, but semi-sacred. When it suits the exigencies of his party "secular" education includes hymns, prayers, and the recognition of God. So Mr. Hollowell, on passive resistance principles, would compel Mr. Blatchford, who rejects Christianity, to pay towards the cost of the Christian observances included in his expanded idea of "secular" education. With the cry of "No tests for teachers" on his lips, he would require school teachers to conduct observances which violated the consciences of some of their number. For, of course, it is not the intention of Mr. Hollowell to bear out of his own pocket any extra proportion of the cost of the religious observances he favours, nor do he and his friends propose to give their time and personal labour in those services. It is all very well for denominationalists to give sites and buildings and money and labour as a set-off for having their own religious teaching whilst bearing their full share of the cost of schools other than their own, but Mr. Hollowell prefers to get his religious observances conducted by the

public teachers\*at the public expense. No wonder that his former associates, the pure secularists, upbraided him for his apostasy, and recommended him, though not in those words, to try the superb tactics of honesty. One secularist protested against this specimen of Nonconformist clericalism, and the President of the National Union of Teachers has publicly advised what he called the "Free Church Porcupine" to "flatten its quills."

I have shown that in England Mr. Hollowell does not follow his own counsel and "try the superb tactics of honesty." It will be instructive to see how far the London Missionary Society, with which Mr. Hollowell as a Congregationalist is associated, carries out in India those principles of passive resistance which its members support in this country. In India the mission schools of the Congregational body (the London Missionary Society) accept grants in aid from the Indian Government. This public money, which is expended in favour of a mere fraction of the population, is almost entirely drawn from native and heathen sources, and is employed to subvert the religion of the contributors. For the mission schools are proselytising institutions; their name implies it; their appeal to the British public proves the fact; it is indeed their *raison d'être*. What is more, there is not even a conscience clause in force. An excellent secular education is offered to native students on condition that they accept the religious instruction which is inseparably bound up with it. Hence it follows that Mr. Hollowell, who objects "conscientiously" to public money going towards the support of the schools of fellow Christians in England, in which a conscience clause is in force, thinks it right to take money exacted from men of totally different faith in order to subvert that faith, the protection of a conscience clause being denied. What is the explanation of this gross inconsistency? Does the difference in longitude justify a difference in the moral standard? It seems as if the theory of passive resistance was invented for temporary use in this country only, and that Mr. Hollowell and his brethren of the London Missionary Society have no intention of trying the superb tactics of

consistency in that connection. Passive resistance is a stick wherewith to beat the Church of England, and must be strictly reserved for that purpose so far as its inventors can rule. But when all is said and done the general public are apt to look with a certain degree of suspicion on men who thus play fast and loose with principle.

Mr. Hollowell's unfairness as a controversialist has caused him to suffer the unpleasant experience of having further correspondence with him in the press declined. Canon Nunn is, I believe, one who has refused to answer his letters. Those who differ most from that clergyman will admit that he is a man who would scorn to cast such a slur on an opponent, except for the gravest reasons. I leave the point to the judgment of the Manchester public. They have had ample opportunity of comparing the controversial standard of morals of both Canon Nunn and Mr. Hollowell.

Mr. Hollowell exalts the conscience of the passive resister, but he can be very severe on consciences other than his own. Referring to a speech by Archbishop Bourne, he wrote: "This is not the first time that conscience has been brought in to justify a public wrong. All the iniquities and persecutions in connection with religion for the last thousand years were done in the name of conscience. A man may be acting from such conscience as he has, and yet his policy may outrage every principle of justice." Some of us will take leave to apply the truth stated in the last sentence in a quarter not contemplated by the writer.

I will close my references to Mr. Hollowell with two examples of his controversial unfairness. Referring to Lord Hugh Cecil's criticism of the tendency inherent in what is called "simple Bible teaching," Mr. Hollowell represented it as opposition to the Bible. His words were, "with Lord Hugh Cecil's talk of the Bible as corrosive poison"—a sheer appeal to popular prejudice. In a speech as member of a deputation to a Minister of the Crown on the day school question, he said: "We do not boast about it, but we have spent twenty millions on Sunday Schools." The reference was a pure irrelevance,

and could only be designed to throw dust in the eyes of the public. The denominationalists whom he was attacking had cared for both Sunday and day school education, those for whom he spoke had not.

I submit that the points herein enumerated, converging as they do towards one conclusion, throw light on the spirit which animates Mr. Hollowell. Let those who dissent from the inference suggested produce as many points of objection against a leader on the other side. Could as many instances of unfairness be enumerated from the actions and utterances of *all* the leaders opposed to him?

#### DR. CLIFFORD.

Although Dr. John Clifford has not personally intervened in the recent agitation, the passive resisters and Free Church Council, whom he leads, have done so, and our sketch of those two groups would be incomplete without some reference to one who perhaps most fully exemplifies the inner spirit of those movements.

Dr. Clifford has been styled by a Nonconformist minister "the idol of Nonconformity." The phrase is couched in the extravagant vein to which we are accustomed from that quarter. Happily the Nonconformists are not idolators, but the fact remains that partly by assumption of leadership, partly by the enthusiastic support of some, and the tacit acquiescence of others, Dr. Clifford has come to exercise an influence and authority which, though temporary, is, whilst it lasts, probably greater than that of the whole bench of those bishops at whom he is never tired of girding. He affords a notable example of the ease with which a religious democracy slides into something approaching one-man rule, and how a cleric may rail at "clericalism" in an alien church whilst exemplifying it in his own. It will not be lost time to throw a few side-lights on the character of a man who has made it necessary to study him, and who deserves to have expended on himself a little of that criticism which he so prodigally bestows on others. "He that is first in his own cause seemeth just, but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him" (Prov. xviii. 17).

Dr. Clifford, in one of his speeches, claimed to represent "the whole of the enlightened world." His idea of representation seems about as hazy as that of our own Citizens' Committee. Just as we may ask, When and how did the citizens of Manchester elect the so-called Citizens' Committee? so we may ask, When and how did the whole of the enlightened world choose Dr. Clifford to represent it? A man who at once represents "the whole of the Free Churches" and "the whole of the enlightened world" has a large constituency. What constitutes "the enlightened world"? Obviously, agreement with Dr. Clifford. In the same way the benighted world is that portion which rejects the light of his wisdom.

Perhaps it may be said that there was a vein of playfulness in this claim of Dr. Clifford. I have no wish to press his words unduly against him. At the best it was an unwise utterance, displaying a defective sense of the responsibility of leadership; at the worst, it was an untruth. No Anglican bishop could have given it utterance. But let us pass from this speech to one made in all seriousness in my own hearing in Manchester. Speaking at the passive resistance demonstration in the Town Hall, Dr. Clifford said that "the passive resistance movement was divine in its impulse, divine in its advance, and divine in its illimitable issues." Considering that the first "impulse" towards the practice of passive resistance came in the form of a suggestion made in the House of Commons by Sir George White, the statement that "passive resistance is "divine in its impulse" implies one of those failures to distinguish between the human and the divine with which Dr. Clifford has made us only too familiar. Considering that the "advance" of the agitation has been marked by misrepresentation, bitterness, and uncharitableness, the statement that passive resistance is "divine in its advance" implies a failure to distinguish between celestial and terrestrial sources of inspiration. Considering that one of the "issues" to which this agitation points is either the total banishment of divine things from the day school or the reduction of the Divine Word to a mere shadow of itself in the "literary, historical, and ethical"

aspects which Dr. Clifford alone admits in that connection, the statement that passive resistance is "divine in its illimitable issues" displays an inability to distinguish illimitable good from illimitable evil. The task of offering millions of English children as their spiritual food the dry bones of Benthamite morals garnished with a few Scripture scraps is one that can claim no divine commission.

Whilst attacking bishops and priests he exalts "preachers" (the class to which he himself belongs), ranking them with poets as the originators of new and lofty ideals. I doubt if passive resistance in general, or Dr. Clifford's leadership of it in particular, has tended to raise the standard of controversy to a higher level. No misgiving on the subject seems to afflict Dr. Clifford. He not merely affects the airs of a Baptist Pope, but on one occasion advised his hearers to "cherish healthy interest in their own infallibility." The wholesale erection of Free Church infallibilities is a piece of impolicy on Dr. Clifford's part, unless qualified by the necessary condition that the test of an infallible verdict is coincidence with his own.

We will test Dr. Clifford's judgment by a few instances. A few months ago he stated that the Baptist body to which he belongs does not accept the Apostles' Creed. Against this statement let me set two facts. Two or three years ago, at the International meeting of Baptists, Dr Maclaren, of Manchester, proposed that the assembled Baptists should stand up and recite together the Apostles' Creed as an expression of their unity of belief. This was done. Again, some few weeks after Dr. Clifford's statement was made, Dr. Chevasse, Bishop of Liverpool, paid a friendly visit to the Baptist Union then meeting in that city. After his address, the Bishop was asked by the President to lead the assembly in reciting the Apostles' Creed. How do these facts fit in with Dr. Clifford's statement? Are we to believe that Dr. Maclaren and the assembled Baptists in London and the President and assembly in Liverpool are all wrong on this point and Dr. Clifford right? If, after fifty years' experience as a Baptist minister, he does not know what Baptists believe, he is scarcely likely to be a safe guide in matters outside his own denomination. But let us see.

“GOD BLESS FRANCE.”

With regard to French affairs, Dr. Clifford follows his tendency to judge men and things in the lump. M. Rouvier may exclaim, France is going to pieces (“*La France se dissout.*” Even the Editor of the *Matin* may head a leading article “*Ça craque,*” and M. Chas. Benoist, political editor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, may deplore “not the anarchy of the byeways nor that of the bomb and dagger so much as that which is seen in the decomposition of order and the putrefaction of liberty,” but in the struggle going on in France Dr. Clifford sees nothing but a justifiable attack by the French Government on the hated priest. “Clericalism is the enemy,” he cries after Gambetta, and it is clericalism, not Christianity, which, according to the Baptist cleric, is being attacked. So he publicly extols the work of men who reject worship as a folly and prayer as a weakness, and gives them his benediction in the phrase, “God bless France.” Let me quote the words of M. Briand, “Minister of Public Worship,” in order to see what sort of work it is which a Christian minister blesses. “It is time to get rid of the Christian idea. We have hunted Jesus Christ out of the army, the navy, the schools, insane and orphan asylums, and law courts, and now we must hunt Him out of the State altogether.” Those who consider with Dr. Clifford that all this is mere antagonism to “clericalism” should study the action of the same “Separation Law” in the French colony of Madagascar, where his brethren of the Congregational body have done so much admirable work. I quote from the *Christian World* of October 24th, 1907: “The Madagascar missionary, Rev. T. Rowlands, spoke with a tone of natural despondency. ‘Madagascar’ is written deep on the hearts of the London Missionary Society. It is a field that has been watered by the blood of martyrs. The French occupation, however, was the beginning of the end so far as the London Missionary Society is concerned. As Mr. Rowlands explained, the Society’s staff has diminished almost to vanishing point.” Either Dr. Clifford gave his benediction to the French

Government in ignorance of these well-known facts or with the knowledge of them. In the former case, what shall we say of his intellectual qualifications for leadership; in the latter, how shall we pronounce on his moral title to that position?

A few months after Dr. Clifford's speech a further step in the path of persecution was taken by the Governor of Madagascar. By a single edict he ordered that no day schools should be held in premises used at any time for public worship, thus closing at one stroke 3,000 mission day-schools. Of these many were Protestant institutions, among them being not a few schools of the London Missionary Society.

The Roman Catholic missionaries in Madagascar, taught by the sufferings of their French brethren over which Dr. Clifford rejoiced, submitted quietly to the Governor's edict, but the Protestant missionaries attempted to influence the French Senate in their favour through the representations of M. Pressensé. Upon this the Governor sent a leading article, which was inserted in the *Matin* newspaper. The heading was "Protestantism is the Enemy," and in the course of the article M. Augagneur accused the Protestant missionaries of being the enemies of the State. When the Governor of Madagascar cries "Protestantism is the enemy" will Dr. Clifford say "Amen," and bless that work as he blessed the corresponding work in France?

I think that Dr. A. M. Fairbairn was nearer the mark than Dr. Clifford when, writing in 1884, he used the following words in reference to the party now dominant in France: "And to-day, if you want to find a party that has in its heart the will to be intolerant, you have but to look across the Channel, where the party most active in its negations is prepared to proceed to extremest measures of repression both as regards the profession and practice of religion."

#### DR. CLIFFORD'S MALEDICTIONS.

We have presented an instance of the way in which Dr. Clifford confers his blessing. Let us see how he bestows his denunciations. His treatment of the Congo question

shows that even when he has a case he goes far to spoil it by tactless management. Dr. Clifford, in a public speech, called the King of the Belgians "the worst man in Europe," and said that the Belgian people were being kept in the dark on the Congo question. Has Dr. Clifford measured the moral character of every man in Europe that he is able to declare that King Leopold is the worst of all these hundreds of millions? Of course he has not, the sentence is mere fustian. We all desire the reform of the Congo administration, but reform is hindered rather than helped by insults hurled at the head of a friendly State. Those of us who recollect the unscrupulous way in which Dr. Clifford exploited the disgraceful cry of "Chinese slavery" will fear that enlightened Belgians will argue that the Congo matter is only another of Dr. Clifford's exaggerations. He achieved the distinction of writing a preface for an anonymous author on that subject, in which were reproduced the illustrations which had appeared in the *Morning Leader*.

Nothing is more instructive than Dr. Clifford's speech, unless it be his silence. He who was so eloquent on the Chinese labour question had, so far as I have seen, no word of exhortation over the New Hebrides labour question. Why this difference? Does the convenience of a Liberal Government override the judgment of the Nonconformist conscience?

So, too, in reference to what has been called "slave-grown cocoa" Dr. Clifford has maintained a significant silence. Does the fact that the great Quaker cocoa firms of Cadbury, Fry, and Rowntree are concerned in the trade explain the fact that he is dumb in this case? In a Liberal paper, the *Sheffield Independent*, I find in the issue of December 16th, 1907, the headlines "Slavery Scandals—the Horrors of San Thomé and Principe—Damnable Traffic—What the Cadbury Inquiry has Revealed." In the *Daily News* of a few months ago a missionary, who wrote in a tone friendly and considerate to the cocoa firms, incidentally made the damaging admission that in the course of twenty years' experience he had not known a single case of repatriation. I shall deal more fully with the question later on.

Dr. Clifford is scarcely qualified to write an authoritative treatise on the morality of preface-writing. I have only happened to see two prefaces from his pen. In the one, as before stated, he fathered an anonymous work, illustrated by misleading pictures; in the other he recommended a book of which he declared the main thesis to be false to fact. The title of the booklet was "Can a man be a Christian who drinks?" Of course the writer means "Can a man who drinks be a Christian?" He argues that it is impossible, while Dr. Clifford says in his preface that he has known cases of sincere Christians who were not total abstainers. Loyalty to truth would, one might think, oblige Dr. Clifford to withhold his approval of a book which is false to fact. No, his advice amounts to this—although the argument is not correct it will do you good to read it. To thus tamper with facts and make falsehood a stepping-stone to truth does not argue a very lofty sense of principle.

**DR. CLIFFORD ACCUSED OF "A FLAT LIE"—NEITHER DENIAL  
NOR EXPLANATION NOR APOLOGY.**

We have given specimens of Dr. Clifford's arrogant claims, of his lack of insight in dealing with the situations in France and the Congo, and of the remarkable vagaries of the Nonconformist conscience in the objects of his denunciations. Let us now consider some of his controversial methods. The *Church Times* of January 18th, 1907, says: "A falsehood which we exposed last June has been once more exploited by Dr. Clifford." After showing that the article from which Dr. Clifford quoted was written more than thirty years ago and under essentially different circumstances, the *Church Times* proceeds: "Dr. Clifford quotes remarks of that date as proof that we aim at using the compulsory attendance of children at the present public elementary schools for the purpose of forcing on all the teaching of the Church. The suggestion is a flat lie. There is no other word; for our real position in the matter is evident to all who study our columns." Dr. Clifford found silence a convenient resource after this exposure.

## DR. CLIFFORD'S THREE BLACK CROWS.

We have all heard the case of "something as black as a crow," which by successive stages in successive mouths became "three black crows." Dr. Clifford requires no assistance in developing a legend. Give him a shred of fact to begin with and he is equal, quite unaided, to the task of manipulating it out of all recognition. The germ of the legend in this case is the following sentence written by the late Cardinal Vaughan to Mr. John Redmond, M.P., after the passing of the Education Bill of 1902: "We see in the triumph of the Government over the Nonconformist opposition as strong a guarantee as we can ever expect to get for liberty to educate Catholic children in the Catholic religion in our elementary schools" (*Tablet*, October 11th, 1902). My readers will observe that the Cardinal speaks, not of any injurious triumph over Nonconformity in the country, but of the extent to which its representatives in Parliament had been able or unable to frustrate what he was bound to believe the cause of religious liberty for Catholic parents and children. How does Dr. Clifford extract offence out of this inoffensive remark in order to manufacture one of those catch phrases which are so often made to do duty for fact and argument? First, he transfers the scene from Parliament to the country; next he changes the note of Catholic defence into one of defiance. He then sums up his idea in a phrase, sets it in inverted commas, and presents it to the Nonconformist press, which in its turn exploits it to the utmost. But all this is not sufficient for Dr. Clifford. He now changes the time of the utterance from after to before the passing of the Act. Writing to the *Christian World* (June 6th, 1907), Dr. Clifford said: "We do not forget that the late Cardinal Vaughan urged the passing of the Education Bill of 1902 on the ground that it was a 'triumph over Nonconformity.'" Mr. John G. Sully, in the *Christian World*, of June 13th, 1907, asked Dr. Clifford to "withdraw this unjust charge against one who can no longer defend himself," but I have not seen any response to his appeal.

We are all familiar with the legend that "the bishops," as one version goes, or Convocation, according to another, forced the rate-aid proposal on Mr. Balfour. The bishops do not appear to have been enamoured of the rate-aid proposal; perhaps they were not sure that the schools connected with the Church of England would always be fairly dealt with by the local authorities. If so, their misgivings were well grounded. However that may be, it seems the height of folly to believe that a Bill for which the main sponsors were Mr. Balfour (a Presbyterian), Mr. Chamberlain (a Unitarian), and the Duke of Devonshire, one of the broadest-minded of Churchmen, should be represented as the product of Anglican episcopal dictation.

#### "HOLLOW AND INSINCERE."

The language employed by Dr. Clifford in the education controversy is frequently of an objectionable character. Breaches of the Ninth Commandment are much in evidence. When Mr. Balfour wrote a letter, in which he set forth arguments in favour of the Education Bill, Dr. Clifford disposed of it by the conveniently easy and summary method of calling the letter "hollow and insincere." If the letter were hollow, why not expose its hollowness? To hurl a charge of insincerity at the Prime Minister without offering a shadow of proof in its support is conduct from which a decent man of the world would shrink. But Dr. Clifford is in business as a leading Nonconformist agitator, and shooting poisoned arrows would seem not to be forbidden by the moral code of his business.

#### "ARCHBISHOP'S BAIT."

Dr. Clifford's references to the Archbishop of Canterbury have, to my knowledge, aroused great indignation in the minds of many men uncommitted to either side. When the Primate made a mild and conciliatory speech at Ramsgate on the Education question, the *Daily News* (which rejects betting news in favour of matter sometimes inferior) reported Dr. Clifford's comments under the characteristic heading, "Archbishop's Bait—Nonconfor-

mists too wary to accept it." This is beneath the level of that "Yellow Press" which the *Daily News* affects to despise. After expressing its own version in the heading of the letter, it proceeds to report the letter of Dr. Clifford, which supplies an appropriate sequel. He speaks of the Primate's speech as "full of fine phrases and of soft and deceptive words." In another sentence Dr. Clifford writes: "I think the Archbishop's speech does not deserve the attention of fair-minded and reasonable men." He thus treats the Primate's speech in much the same way as he treated Mr. Balfour's letter. By his authority as a sort of Baptist Pope, "cherishing a healthy interest in his own infallibility," he puts, as far as he can, both letter and speech on the Nonconformist Index.

#### "HONEYED WORDS."

About twelve months ago, in a New Year's address to the Baptist denomination, Dr. Clifford warned his co-religionists against "the honeyed words" of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and in his eagerness to encourage continued passive resistance went back to the days of the pillory in his efforts to excite sectarian hatred. One Baptist long, long ago had "given his ears" for the good cause, and should the Baptists of to-day shrink from the slighter inconveniences of passive resistance? Such language breathes the very spirit of persecution. Even a man of the world will acknowledge the appeal to "forget and forgive" comparatively recent wrongs, but a Christian minister goes back into ancient history to ferret out wrongs done to members of his religious denomination many generations before our grandfathers were born. Instead of "forgiving his brother till seventy times seven," he holds him responsible for the sins of men dead and buried a hundred years and more before he was born. It is the argument of the wolf with the lamb in the fable. It is opposed to the Christian religion, the law of love, and the spirit of Jesus. It is bitter unreasonableness where we have a right to expect "sweet reasonableness." It is persecution pure and simple. It feeds sectarian bigotry and stirs up sectarian strife. It makes the law

of love into the law of hate. It discredits Christianity and disgraces Nonconformity. At one stroke it weakens the bonds of brotherly love among Christians, and the ties which unite men in civil society.

#### OTHER APPEALS TO PERSECUTING SPIRIT.

We have seen the intolerant spirit in which Dr. Clifford pursues the Archbishop and Bishops of the Church of England. I need not give instances of his numerous invectives against "the priests" of the Romish Church. Now John Bull has in the past tried the plan of persecuting these same "priests," and found it a poor business. He may not like them, but he wishes to do them justice, and no invectives from the lips or pen of Dr. Clifford will induce Englishmen to go back to the old penal laws against Roman Catholics. The pillorying of the Baptist referred to by Dr. Clifford is as nothing compared with the savage persecutions to which Roman Catholics were subjected in more recent times. In Ireland, for example, where nine-tenths of the people were Catholics, no Catholic was allowed to be a lawyer, doctor, or schoolmaster. A priest who married a Protestant and a Catholic was to be hanged, and so on. Those days are gone, thanks largely to the efforts of an Anglican clergyman, Sydney Smith. Even in England the right of public worship for Roman Catholics is not a hundred years old. Let us then have no further appeals to bigotry. Lord George Gordon riots ought to be out of date.

In addition to the priest and the bishops, Dr. Clifford has another object in his religious chamber of horrors, and this is "the nun." He seems to think that to say the name is sufficient to excite suspicion, and that the word connotes "meet to be persecuted." So indeed it does to some narrow minds, but the average Englishman wishes to do no injustice to a Roman Catholic "nun" any more than to a Protestant "sister" or "deaconess." Not so Dr. Clifford, he was up in arms the other day because two teachers in the garb of nuns were reported to be teaching in one of the London public schools. Inquiry showed that they were students from a neighbouring training

college for teachers, who were merely putting in a few of those school practices required from all students in training. So vigilant is Dr. Clifford about trifles.

At the Manchester Town Hall he told in my hearing a dreadful tale of a nun who had been getting £60 a year, but who, under the "Balfour Act," received £120. This, he had previously explained in a letter to the press, amounted to an endowment of Popery to the extent of £60 a year, because the money would probably be handed to the priest. What are the facts? The nun in question had received £60 a year because her employers (being excluded from the ratial benefit so long enjoyed by Board Schools and teachers) were unable to pay her more. When the Board took charge of the school her salary, according to her qualifications, was under the scale of the Board, £120 a year. Thus for years she had been fined £60 a year for her religion, and it is the tardy removal of this injustice which is construed by Dr. Clifford into a bounty to her Church. The cessation of a fine is deemed an endowment! As to how the nun in question spends money she has earned, is that a matter for Dr. Clifford, or, indeed, for anybody except herself? He has no more to do with that than Roman Catholics have to do with the contributions of Protestant day school teachers, say, to Dr. Clifford's own church. The whole incident shows in a striking manner how incapable Dr. Clifford is of doing common justice to a class he dislikes.

#### A QUOTATION FROM MILTON.

In his straining after effect Dr. Clifford sometimes makes strange slips. At a meeting of Nonconformist ministers, held to lodge a protest on the Education question, he called out to his assembled brethren, "Awake, arise, or be for ever fallen!" Those who remembered their Milton would wince under the exhortation, seeing that the words quoted occur in Satan's address to the fallen angels in Pandemonium. Dr. Clifford, as arch demon and themselves as minor demons, would scarcely be a picture to their minds. As a preacher Dr. Clifford should know how important it is to study the context of a verse. It

is interesting to note that even in this extreme case the instinct of primacy did not desert him.

#### NONCONFORMIST FAIRNESS NOT AN EXTINCT QUALITY.

Happily there are signs that all Nonconformists do not approve Dr. Clifford's methods and language. As far back as September 27th, 1904, appeared a protest on the point in the *Manchester Guardian*, in which Mr. John G. Sully, quoting the words of Dr. Clifford to the effect that Parliament had been engaged in "supplying the agents of the Anglican and Roman Churches with the instruments by which they may pick the pockets of their neighbours," Mr. Sully went on to say, "I would earnestly protest against such charges. Surely our case for an amendment of the Education Acts is being steadily given away by Dr. Clifford's advocacy and the extravagance of most passive resisters. O conscience! What things are still being said and done in thy name." Referring to the proposal for the Free Church Council to lend moral support to the Welsh campaign of resistance to the Default Bill engineered by Mr. Lloyd George, he added, "If this is confirmed by the General Committee a most severe blow will be given to Nonconformity, and, what is more, to the cause of our common Christianity."

In the same issue of the *Manchester Guardian* there also appeared a letter from the Rev. J. M. Phillips, of Middleton, who, writing as a Congregational minister, said: "As an educationist who thinks more of the interests of the children than of sects—be they Established or Free—my best instincts rebel against the passive resistance movement as wrong in principle and doubtful in results."

On one occasion Dr. Clifford had delivered one of his violent harangues against the bishops and clergy of the Church of England, when the Rev. R. J. Campbell rose and expressly dissociated himself from the sentiments the former had expressed. A Free Church deputation to the Church Congress, held at Yarmouth last summer, expressed "the just resentment" with which many Nonconformists had witnessed the misrepresentations of the Archbishop's words and motives which had been put for-

ward. In the Baptist Union itself, when the unsatisfactory denominational statistics were under discussion, one minister indicated political activity as a hindrance to spiritual life, and said that they could scarcely keep pace with Dr. Clifford's extravagant youthfulness. It is certain that political effort levies a heavy toll on the religious spirit of a denomination.

### PLATFORM "MORALITY."

In April, 1907, the *Christian World* contained a leading article which is not without bearing on the platform utterances of some Free Church leaders. "There are vices of the platform," it said, "as patent as those of the slums. The place is full of ethical dangers, which prominent professors of morality all too frequently fall into. Oratory in itself is an exercise sufficiently parlous to the soul. There have not been wanting writers who have condemned it as always on a moral plane more or less low. Froude could not away with eloquence; it was nearly always, he said, misleading, dishonest to the simple fact. What is unquestionably the fact is that the habit of public speaking, of addressing applauding audiences, is one full of perils to character, perils that unchecked may eat away a man's whole moral fibre, and leave him, whose business is the praise of sanctity, himself at its farthest remove."

### THE GAME OF "FAST AND LOOSE" WITH PASSIVE RESISTANCE PRINCIPLES.

We know, from being told, that the sacred principle of passive resistance is that no one must be obliged to contribute towards religious teaching to which he conscientiously objects. Let us see how Dr. Clifford himself keeps this rule. At Newcastle, in 1904, he advocated before the Free Church National Council, and secured the adoption of a plan of "simple Biblical instruction" as a suggestion of the way in which he and his friends would meet the religious difficulty. Under it the Jew would pay towards New Testament teaching, which he utterly rejects; the Unitarian would help to propagate Trinitarian

doctrine; the Roman Catholic would contribute towards Protestant teaching given in a Protestant atmosphere through the medium of a Protestant version; the Atheist would give his quota in aid of theistical teaching; the Agnostic would promote the representation as historical facts of what he holds to be legendary, and so on. It is obvious then that this scheme of the passive resisters contains materials for the manufacture of other passive resisters by the million. Mr. Gerard N. Ford, of Manchester, opposed the proposal of Dr. Clifford, and said that as a passive resister himself he would be no party to making passive resisters of others, but he was over-ruled. The scheme included a conscience clause—in itself a tacit acknowledgment that some consciences would be violated by being subjected to the religious teaching he advocated. A conscience clause which, they have often told us, is no protection for the Dissenter as against the Churchman, though both are Christians, is quite a sufficient protection for the non-Christian as against the Christian, when it suits the convenience of Dr. Clifford. The hollowness of the old cry, “The Conscience clause no Protection,” could not be more clearly proved.

#### THE WOBBLING OF DR. CLIFFORD.

After the plan of “simple Bible teaching” had been launched at the Newcastle Conference, the doom which apparently attaches to Newcastle Conferences descended upon it. The fundamental contradiction of passive resistance principles involved was soon made apparent, even to the leaders of the Council, and the result appeared in successive explanations, interpretations, and modifications thereof. That the offspring of the Free Church Council was unquestionably illegitimate in its origin was only too obvious. The plan adopted was to reduce their child’s size, so that they were able to tell a wondering and amused world that if illegitimate it was, at any rate, a little one. They did this without acknowledging their obligations to Captain Marryat. The religious food of “simple Bible teaching” subjected to Dr. Clifford’s reducing process, thinned down into a sort of diet of Bible

scraps. These bits were to be robbed of any religious juice they contained by the condition that the treatment of them was to be "exclusively of an ethical, historical, and literary character." So that for genuine religious teaching was substituted merely mental cultivation under the guise of "Bible teaching." When the soul of the child, greatly hungering, asks Dr. Clifford for "bread" he offers it this Benthamite "stone."

The attenuated and nebulous scheme of the Council naturally excited the misgivings of denominationalists. Dr. Wace asked Dr. Clifford if his scheme of religious instruction included the teaching of the deity of Jesus Christ, but was unable to extract a clear answer. The dilemma of Dr. Clifford was obvious. If he said no, he would offend Mr. Perks, the Rev. J. S. Lidgett, and the other Methodists who support the Free Church Council; if he said yes, he would stand convicted on his own admission of seeking to compel Jews, Unitarians, Agnostics, and others to contribute towards the payment of religious instruction to which they conscientiously object, thus violating the fundamental principle of passive resistance. A religious leader who puts forward a plan for the religious education of six millions of English children and when asked a straightforward question on a vital point declines to give a straightforward answer scarcely commends himself or his friends or his cause to reasonable and fair-minded men. The children of a whole nation were never intended to become a mere pawn in Dr. Clifford's partisan game.

#### PASSIVE RESISTANCE A GEOGRAPHICAL EXPRESSION.

We have seen that passive resistance principles, preached by Congregationalists in England, are abjured by them in India in the operations of the London Missionary Society. So many degrees of longitude, and behold! another code of morals. Sometimes it is a question of latitude, as in the case of Scotland. Many passive resisters speak of Scotland as an educational model, and Dr. Clifford, appealing to the electors of a Scotch constituency in a bye-election before 1906, asked them to

send a member who would help him in his struggle against Mr. Balfour's "iniquitous" Education Act. Yet he knew, as we all know, that in Scotland a denominational formulary, the Shorter Catechism, is taught (1) in the Board schools, (2) by the school teachers, (3) in school hours, and (4) entirely at the public expense. By this arrangement many thousand consciences are violated. From all this one would think that a passive resister who possessed an unsophisticated conscience would shrink in disgust. But no; on men thus guilty of a flagrant breach of the passive resistance rule, Dr. Clifford smiles approval, treats them as friends and allies, and begs their aid in his passive resistance crusade. Presbyterianism, with a beam in its own eye, was invited to help him in extracting the mote out of the Anglican eye. And Presbyterianism proved nothing loth to return to an old-time practice.

I have spoken of passive resistance as a geographical expression—one rule in England and another in India; again one rule south of the Cheviots and quite another on the north, but, of course, the true explanation is quite different. The passive resistance theory was devised in a political exigency as a temporary expedient and for local use. Like the militia, it was not intended for employment outside England. That the movement is a matter of minor tactics rather than of high principle is amply proved by the fact that Mr. Hollowell's co-religionists flout in India the principles they preach in England, while Dr. Clifford blesses on one side of the Scotch Border what he curses on the other.

"NO TESTS FOR TEACHERS," *i.e.*, NO HONEST TESTS, BUT  
BACKSTAIRS ONES.

The passive resistance leaders who took up the cry of "No religious tests for teachers" probably thought that they had got hold of a popular catch-phrase which would moreover help to ingratiate them with that powerful section of the day school teachers which regards all association with the clergy as a symbol of their own professional subordination. But the cry was scarcely an honest one, as may easily be proved. Indeed, the way in which the

two opposing parties approach this question is characteristic. The churches attacked started with the interests of the children and the wishes of the parents. Children need religious education, and their parents desire it. Hence in their interests it must be given. But those who desire an end implicitly desire the means necessary to the attainment of that end, and the demand for religious instruction is virtually a demand for teachers capable of giving it. If this requirement clashes with the aims or convenience of prospective teachers, these latter must be told that the thousands of teachers exist for the millions of children, and not vice versâ. All this is honest, straightforward, and above-board. It merely carries into practice the principle that those who teach a subject should be qualified to teach it.

So much for the party attacked. What of the attacking party which echoes the cry of "no tests"? We find Mr. Perks, to take one notable example, stating in the House of Commons that Wesleyans desired not merely Bible teaching but also Bible instruction. Is, then, this Bible instruction to be given by men who do not believe what they teach—by anyone who comes along? Obviously either the obligation to give the Bible instruction desired by Mr. Perks and his brother Wesleyans reacts selectively on the teachers, or it does not. If it does react, and keeps out unsuitable teachers, a test is in actual operation, and the cry of "no tests" is a mockery. If it does not, and professed enemies of the Bible are among those set to teach the Bible, what a situation is created! Any attempt to escape the dilemma just indicated by a conscience clause for teachers would place the religious education of the country at the mercy of the N.U.T. or any powerful group of teachers. The difference between the two parties is that Churchmen openly and honestly advocate only so much of a test as is necessary for efficiency of teaching, while the Nonconformists with loud shouts put out tests at the front door, only to re-introduce them surreptitiously at the back. The Bishop of St. Asaph complained that in choosing teachers for a certain part of Wales the Nonconformist caucus met and decided which candidate

to support in the Board meetings on the occasion of a teacher's election.

The treatment of teachers in West Riding denominational schools by the County Council for that division, as also that practised in parts of Wales, seems to have opened the eyes of teachers to the fact that Nonconformists took up the cry of "No tests" mainly as a party weapon. Salaries attempted to be docked here, salaries held back before the summer holidays there—these are queer proofs of friendship. The National Union of Teachers has been driven to black-list certain Swansea schools, and Mr. Pickles, president of the N.U.T., spoke of the Anglican hedgehog and the Free Church porcupine as needing to live on better terms with each other. The Free Church porcupine must, he said, learn to flatten its quills. The hedgehog is, I believe, an inoffensive creature, which only rolls itself up as a measure of self-defence against an aggressor. It is to be hoped that our porcupines will note the significant hint given them by the president of the National Union of Teachers. It is one of numerous signs that the country is beginning to grow weary of their tactics.

The general public has not time to follow the detailed administration of the Education Act, and it may therefore serve to give an instance of the persecuting spirit displayed by certain local educational authorities where Free Churchmen sway the Council. A Welsh correspondent, writing in the *Christian World* for December 26th, 1907, says: "The tenacity with which Welsh Education Authorities cling to the fundamental principles underlying the Welsh Education Revolt of three or four years ago materially increases Mr. McKenna's perplexities in the administration of his already difficult department. At the time of writing some of these authorities are perplexed to determine to what extent Christmastide's generous consideration for individual Non-Provided School teachers justifies temporary departure from the principle of No-Rate-Aid."

In the latter sentence we have the edifying spectacle of Welsh Nonconformists considering whether a slight

instalment of justice should be given to teachers in denominational schools. And this temporary and partial remission of the fine imposed on these victims of Free Church tyranny is represented in the hypocritical guise of a Christmas dole. How long has the partial cessation of persecution been deemed a mark of "generous consideration"? These little touches are the most self-revealing of all.

I will deal more fully with the case of the late London County Council, of which Mr. Scott Lidgett was a leading member. Whoever is responsible for the denominational system of education, all will agree that the teachers employed in those schools are not, yet Free Churchmen descend to the meanness and injustice of penalising those who earn their daily bread in the schools which the friends of justice and equality dislike. I extract the following report from the *Manchester Guardian* for January 30th, 1907:—

### COUNTY COUNCIL INCREASE SALARIES.

"Yesterday afternoon the London County Council received from the Education Committee a report recommending that increases be made in the salaries paid to teachers in non-provided schools.

"Mr. A. J. Shephard, in moving the adoption of the report, said it was proposed that every teacher in a non-provided school would either immediately or within three years at the latest be put upon at least the minimum of the scale in the Council schools. They would be put on the minimum scale immediately unless the increase in doing so was more than £20. If it were more than £20 the increase would be spread over one, two, or three years. The Committee felt that in making this recommendation *they were only doing an act of justice which they promised as far back as June, 1905.*

"Mr. J. T. Taylor described the recommendation as a tardy, imperfect, and inadequate reparation of a great injustice. On the principle, however, that half a loaf was better than no bread he would accept what was

offered rather than move to refer it back for the purpose of getting all the teachers were entitled to.

"Sir T. Brooke-Hitching said he thought the teachers in non-provided schools were to be congratulated on the nearness of the County Council elections."

We note on the above extract that—

1. An act of justice promised in June, 1905, was not performed till 1907, when the fear of the electors was upon them.

2. Even then denominational teachers were to be raised only to the *minimum* scale applied to teachers in the favoured provided schools.

3. Where the change would involve an increase of more than £20 the shock of equal treatment would probably prove too great for the recipients. Hence the steps towards equality must be graded and take in some cases three years to travel.

Londoners showed in the election of March, 1907, what they thought of this miserable work, in which breach of faith competed with meanness for the front place. How amusing to behold a moribund and discredited party proposing a partial and grudging reparation of their own act of injustice, and that at the expense of the new Council. They arranged for the gradations of advance towards the haven of the minimum scale, to be spread in some cases over three years, as if their party were perpetual masters of the City Council. How does a prominent Congregationalist like Mr. A. J. Sheppard, the chairman of the Education Committee, or a leading Wesleyan minister like the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, reconcile their treatment of these labourers in the educational field with common justice and common fairness? I say nothing of their Christianity. On that point I am content to quote words from the Epistle of St. James (v. 4), which are only too applicable to the occasion: "Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of sabaoth."

The unfair action of the L.C.C. Education Committee

was not confined to its victims in the non-provided schools. The people of London were cheated of their rights to publicity in regard to the proceedings of that committee. Succeeding to the work of the London School Board, which had always opened its doors to reporters, the Education Committee of the County Council abrogated a wholesome practice of over thirty years' standing, and decided to dispose of public money, to the extent of four millions yearly, in secrecy. Riding off characteristically on the purely technical plea that the Education Committee was not a committee of the whole Council, they decided to persist in the policy of shunning publicity in spite of protests alike from friends and foes. What the London public saw was the material point that whereas the old School Board had welcomed the light, the new Education Committee shunned it. Of course, this rather mean action was dictated *more suo* by the loftiest motives. Still, as the election of March, 1907, approached, and the dominant party began to cast about for support at the forthcoming polls, some concession to public opinion was probably felt to be politic, for Mr. Mackinnon Wood made the magnanimous declaration that the proceedings of the Education Committee would be open to the public—after March, that is, under the next Council! The *British Weekly* grimly reminded Mr. Wood that after March the settlement of the matter might be in other hands. And so it proved. But what shall we say of the sublimity of arrogant folly which declines to correct an admitted mistake and pledges a future Council which is beyond its control to remedy the wrong done by the present one which is under its control? The old Council declines to repent and lead a better life, but promises that the new Council shall repent and depart from the sins of its predecessor. What should we think of a Prime Minister who declared that a practice initiated by his own party in the lifetime of that Parliament had been wrong, but that after the dissolution the practice should be reversed? Stated thus baldly Mr Wood's attitude is seen to be utterly irrational, but, of course, his language is saved from sheer Bedlamism by the audacious assumption that the London County

Council was for all time in the hands of his party, and that he, as its absolute dictator, was free to dispose of its fortunes after the coming election as before. We know how rudely that fond delusion was dispelled in the election of 1907, and with what virulence of criticism every movement of the new majority has been followed by those London papers which had assumed that the Council was for all time to be in the hands of their party. The *Daily News* represents so accurately the narrowness and bitterness of the Free Church party that it may be worth while to give a specimen or two of its discreditable tactics.

Under the heading "Execrable Taste," it printed a letter from a correspondent who protested against the action of a clergyman who had presumed to preach the day school sermons in his church about Christmas time. It was held that Nonconformists who attended the service at that festive season would be annoyed at such a subject being chosen. One would think that the "execrable taste" exhibited consisted in the effort of chapel people to dictate church services. But no, it was "execrable taste," it seems, not to bow to such dictation!

When in December, 1907, the Municipal Reformers decided to appeal for private funds to help necessitous children rather than add to the heavy rates of the Metropolis by opening a fresh claim for municipal expenditure, the *Daily News* headed the leader in which it commented on this step with the words "Let them starve." The "yellow press," at which the *Daily News* often self-righteously rails, seldom descends so low as this. The *Spectator*, in the following words, administered a merited rebuke: "A more unjust or unjustifiable suggestion it would be difficult to imagine. The *Daily News* has every right to hold and express its own views strongly, and to hit its opponents hard, but to impute cynical callousness and cold-blooded barbarity is utterly unworthy of English journalism, and must lower the paper in the opinion of all fair-minded men. Those who oppose feeding the children out of the rates may be wrong, but we venture to say that they care about the true interests of the children far more than those who in their levity and ignorance are

as careless in regard to pauperising the coming generation as they are in regard to the burdens laid upon the poor or the slanderous accusations which they prefer against their opponents."

For anyone to condemn any action of the majority on the last County Council, or to support that of the present majority, is, in the eyes of the *Daily News*, to commit the unpardonable sin. When the *British Weekly* attacked the late Council as lacking in economy, efficiency, and other virtues, the *Daily News* hotly resented the attack, and complained that the name of Mr. Mackinnon Wood had been miswritten. By way of punishment it dubbed Dr. Nicoll's organ a "Moderate" paper, for to the *Daily News* the application of that hated word as a nickname saved all need for argument. Yet the *Daily News* can on occasion preach self-restraint in controversy. Here are its words: "We may, however, suggest that the discussion of these matters is an opportunity for displaying the gentleness and personal restraint without which there can be no truly Christian conduct." Why this marked difference of tone? The explanation is that in the latter case Free Churchmen, instead of attacking their political and ecclesiastical foes, were turning their arms against each other over the question of the "New Theology." We thank the *Daily News* for teaching us that "without gentleness and personal restraint there can be no truly Christian conduct." We decline to limit the sweep of the dictum to those cases which suit the partisan convenience of the *Daily News*, and even presume to apply that paper's test of Christian conduct to its own utterances. Weighed in its own balances, it is found wanting.

#### THE NEMESIS OF HISTORY.

When I reflect on the respectful attitude of most Liberal and Nonconformist statesmen of the present day to Roman Catholics and their schools, my mind is irresistibly carried back to the deeds of Cromwell in Ireland and the persecuting laws under which Catholics suffered both in England and Ireland down to a comparatively recent period. While certain Dissenters in this country

are going back centuries for cases of comparatively mild persecution of their body, or, in the guise of passive resisters, are placing on their own heads an empty simulacrum of the martyr's crown, Catholics look back upon a long and blood-stained record of relentless persecution suffered at the hands of Protestants here and in Ireland. What Nonconformists conveniently forget, they remember. They recall the deeds of Cromwell two and a half centuries ago—the massacre of over 2,000 persons at Drogheda—a church fired to drive out the refugees who had taken shelter therein—Cromwell's Puritan soldiers slaughtering the hapless wretches as they emerged from the flames only to perish by the sword—the insulting cry of Cromwell's troopers as the "pacified" islanders were given the option of "Hell or Connaught." These were "methods of barbarism" indeed, but which Cromwell seems to have regarded as a regrettable necessity.

Turn to England in 1769, and at the Old Bailey Father James Talbot, brother of the Earl of Shrewsbury, stands indicted on the capital charge of having celebrated mass, being only acquitted for want of evidence. Take the Lord Gordon "No Popery" riots of 1780. Take, finally, the fact that only in 1829, less than eighty years ago, was the Catholic Emancipation Act passed.

What is to-day's counterpart to this picture of the past? Is not its Nemesis upon us now? True, there is Mr. Hollowell, a Cromwellian, but without Cromwell's coercive resources, who says vaguely that England must talk to Roman Catholics after the modern French style—for even he feels that Cromwellian methods are now slightly out of date. In his mouth the cry of the Puritan soldiery, "To Hell or Connaught," is softened down into the alternative of "Bible teaching or Secular Education." Then, too, there is Dr. Clifford, who rails at "the priest" from press and platform, but there is no lightning in his stage thunder. The Baptist champion may manage to stir up sectarian hatred among his followers, but he will not succeed in engaging English statesmen to re-enter on the hateful paths of religious persecution. No, the real antithesis of the old persecuting days is seen in the

comparative impotence of the two hundred Nonconformist members of Parliament in contrast with the influence of Mr. Redmond's eighty Catholics, or when the Dublin Convention threw Mr. Birrell's Irish Council Bill in his face, and Mr. Birrell meekly bowed his head, or when Mr. Birrell introduced Clause 4 of his Education Bill (as he himself said) "to please the Roman Catholics and Jews," or when Mr. McKenna dropped his one-fifteenth bill at the hint of passive resistance from Catholics, or when the Prime Minister of England sat in unprotesting silence to be told by the Roman Catholic Archbishop that some of the new training college regulations they would not obey, or when Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman said he had always thought that they should have special treatment, or when an agnostic statesman like Mr. John Morley twenty years ago suggested separate treatment for Catholics and Jews, or when Dr. Dale and Mr. Henry Richards (as members of the minority in the Royal Commission on Education presided over by Lord Cross) recommended that Roman Catholics should be allowed to retain their present schools, and that new ones erected where required by a Roman Catholic population should, unlike the rule for all other religious bodies, be admitted without question to the Government grant.

May I quote here what I wrote in 1889 in summing up a chapter headed "Will Roman Catholic grant-aided schools be superseded?": "To sum up the argument under this head, the Roman Catholics declare that they mean to keep their schools; they have kept them so far, not one having been transferred to School Board control; they have increased their average attendance in a greater proportion than any other class of denominational school; they possess great advantages over every other church in their unity and subordination, as well as in the great political influence wielded at will by the Pope and the Catholic hierarchy; they have already won concessions denied to all others from the unsectarian party on various School Boards, and the Minority Commissioners themselves, the professed enemies of sacerdotalism, propose in so many words to allow them exceptional privileges. Will

anyone contend, in face of these facts, that Roman Catholic schools are likely to be superseded?"

Nothing has happened since 1889 to weaken the force of the above words; much has occurred to add force to them. By commencing a policy of passive resistance, Dissenters have forged a weapon on which Roman Catholics will not scruple to improve should occasion call, for their passive resistance will not be confined to the buying in of one another's teapots. Dissenters will see, when their bad example is followed and enlarged upon, what powers for mischief were contained in that movement of passive resistance, which, according to Dr. Clifford, is "divine in its impulse, divine in its advance, and divine in its illimitable issues." If, as may possibly happen, one of its "illimitable issues" is a widespread movement of passive resistance as a protest against the Free Church clericalism of Dr. Clifford and his friends, I am afraid that these latter will find it hard to apply the adjective "divine" to such operations. In their usual short-sighted way, they seem to have imagined that they could pick up passive resistance and put it down at pleasure, preserving it as a sort of Nonconformist patent or proprietary article which no other religionist must sacrilegiously appropriate to other than Dissenting purposes.

Some Dissenters would consent, though with reluctance, to grant Roman Catholics their way on the education question, who yet hope to bully and browbeat the Church of England into submission to the Nonconformist demands. But the discussions of the last year or two have amply proved that enforced undenominationalism would be unacceptable to many sincere and devoted Anglicans. If the Roman Catholics represent the edge of the wedge which is destined to make a breach in the Nonconformist arrogant claim, the body of that wedge is represented by that large body of Church opinion which declines to worship at the Cowper-Temple shrine.

**COWPER-TEMPLEISM NOT LIKELY TO ENDURE IF GENERALLY  
ACCEPTED—SUNSHINE ABOLISHED FOR MOONSHINE.**

Nothing in modern education is more marvellous than the development of the Nonconformist affection for Cow-

per-Templeism, or what is called "simple Bible teaching." This teaching was not originated by them, but was commenced, as Mr. Hollowell once put it, "to please the clergy." They originated it in the Board schools, not as the ideal system for all schools, but as the best possible under the limitations imposed on those schools. Had Churchmen deemed Cowper-Templeism completely satisfactory, they would have transferred all their schools to the Boards, which they did not. But the amount of acceptance which the religious teaching of the Board schools won was due (1) To the denominationally-trained teachers who first worked it. (These colleges Mr. McKenna and the Nonconformists now seek to rob of their distinctive character.) (2) To the existence alongside of the Board schools of the denominational schools, the religious teaching in which was at once a standard, a stimulus and a guarantee for the religious teaching in Board schools. (These schools are to give place in the Nonconformist scheme to one uniform type of school.) So that Dr. Clifford desires to abolish the sun, but retain moonshine. He is like a man who saws vigorously between the tree trunk and the branch on which he is sitting.

But let us suppose all these objections waived and a system of Bible teaching universally established---would its life be worth five years' purchase? Religious instruction in public day schools would then have but one neck. Would there be no Caligula to seize the long-looked-for opportunity and deliver the fatal blow? If the secularists started a campaign of passive resistance to a system which infringed their consciences, where would the system find its defenders? Can we imagine Mr. Hollowell and his friends looking on with complacency while, say, Mr. Blatchford and his followers who reject Christianity went to prison rather than pay towards teaching to which they conscientiously objected? Moreover, the fortunes of religious education would be at the mercy of the organised teachers. A large section of the teachers desire to be purely civil servants, and they would only have to raise the cry of no tests for teachers to bring the whole

system to a deadlock. Even those who desire "simple Bible teaching" for its own sake cannot afford to subject its continued existence to such hazards. Wesleyans in particular would find themselves betrayed, and would discover when it was too late that the educational policy of John Scott was wiser than that of John Scott Lidgett.

### "SECULAR SOLUTION" NOT FAIR TO ALL.

Secular education is, we are told, the only "solution" fair to all. It would be more correct to say that the principle of allowing the minority to veto the will of the majority is therein consistently carried out. Free Churchmen, like Dr. Massie, who desire secular education but advocate Cowper-Templeism from pure expediency, admit the principle of veto up to the point that pleases Nonconformists, but decline for the present to go further. They do not allow Jews to veto the New Testament, or Unitarians to veto any reference to the Trinity. Still less would they permit Mr. Blatchford to veto any reference to the Christianity he rejects. But the secularist declines to allow the Free Churchman to play fast and loose with the principle to suit the temporary exigency of the latter. He regards as immoral the attitude of Dr. Massie, who believes that total prohibition is the proper course, but declines to take it because it is unpopular. Mr. Balfour "would sweep the country" if Dr. Massie and his friends displayed fidelity to conviction! The obvious course for men who are never tired of trumpeting the superlative tenderness of their conscience is to refuse to obey its dictates! As a matter of fact, they do not possess conscience enough to enable them to obey conscience.

When Dr. Massie says that if Free Churchmen advocated a universal system of secular schools Mr. Balfour would be able to sweep the country, he admits, what we all know to be the fact, that the vast majority of English parents desire for their children a religious training. They know that religious teaching given by those who believe what they teach will make their children better sons and daughters, better in the home and better out-

side it. And what the parents desire for their children the children's own needs claim for them. It is on these two pillars—the wish of the parents and the needs of the children—that religious education in the day schools ought righteously to stand secure. A minority in the State has no right to interpose and say “because I do not want this for my children you shall not have it for yours.” That would be not the rule of the majority, but the tyranny of the minority.

The State is not neutral as regards religion in the day school if it takes hold of the child under the secular system, compels its attendance for the full school time, and then leaves religious instruction to be given as a sort of punishment lesson out of the ordinary hours. The child is weary in mind and body at the end of the secular hours, and in many cases cannot stay for an extra religious lesson if it would. Some, especially girls, have home tasks awaiting them, some have to take their fathers' meals, others have to run errands, and not a few have to hurry off to perform little paid tasks in order to help out the family finances. In view of facts like these it is idle for doctrinaire writers to speak of secular education either as a “solution” or as being fair to all concerned. It is rather a dissolution than a solution.

Consider, too, what would be the natural effect on a child's mind of seeing so vital a subject as religious teaching thrust out of the programme of school subjects. Would it not be that that particular subject was comparatively unimportant? On exactly the same principle, though in a lesser degree, the distinctive elements dropped out in paring down the religious teaching to the Cowper-Temple model will be regarded by the children as of minor importance. What is omitted they will deem to be omissible.

#### **HOLD OF DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS ON ENGLISH PEOPLE.**

When the School Board system was launched in 1870 it was freely predicted that in a few years the new schools would absorb their denominational rivals. Every advantage appeared to be on their side. With new and superior

buildings, staffed with teachers drawing larger salaries, with all the latest educational appliances at command, enjoying also the prestige of public civic control and the special financial advantage of full command of the rates, the Board schools, in spite of all, failed to crush out their competitors. Free education, it was thought, would prove their ruin, but they survived the change. Even where School Boards were actually instituted large numbers of such cases were not the result of the people's free choice, but followed upon compulsory orders from the Central Department. A system of denominational teaching which so largely survived thirty-two years of such unequal competition must possess a large hold on the nation's heart and life. It has lived because it has deserved to live. A class of school which has won the regard of the English people should not lightly be destroyed. We should remember that the value of a type is not to be measured merely by the number of its existing specimens. A few more or less of a certain class of school makes little matter, but the loss of a type is irremediable.

Even those who intensely dislike what they call the "sectarian" element, which they regard as an inevitable incident in denominational teaching, should ask themselves whether a certain proportion of this may not be tolerated for the sake of the religious training and excellent moral influence with which it is associated. For, after all, "sectarianism" is but the seamy side of religion—the imperfect human grasp of the perfect Divine truth—the parti-coloured spectrum into which the varieties of mortal apprehension break the white light of the immortal verities. No one religious body seems capable of grasping with full apprehension and perfect harmony the revelation of Divine truth. Hence it is the duty of each religious body to bear its witness to the deposit of truth committed to its care, until the time comes when the apparently discordant notes shall be attuned to "make one music."

The American Ambassador to this country, Mr. White-law Reid, in a recent address to American teachers, gave

the palm to English training in religious reverence and social discipline. At a time when the influences adverse to all spiritual belief are so powerful, the nation can ill afford to weaken the religious influences in actual operation. In the denominational schools characters have been moulded, lives fashioned, good citizens formed.

Those who rail most vehemently against "the priest," and seek to utterly destroy denominational teaching, would, I think, hesitate to incur such grave responsibility if they viewed the matter more from the side of the children's needs and less from the standpoint of sectarian animosity. What is to take the place of the present definite teaching in Roman Catholic schools, for example? Cowper-Templeism, taught under the "No Tests for Teachers" system by one who might be a professed unbeliever in what he taught? The avenues of a Catholic child's mind and heart are largely closed to any possibility of moral benefit from such lessons, if lessons they can be called for him. Why, then, destroy a moral influence for which you can produce no equivalent? I say "moral" deliberately, for it is as a moralising force that it enters into the national life as a valuable civic influence. As the late Cardinal Vaughan once said: "We will make the children of our own people good citizens in making them good Catholics." He went on to point out that no form of Protestantism could, as a matter of fact, take the place of Catholicism for these children, and that the choice lay for them between the religion of their parents and no religion at all. Will Dr. Clifford and his followers say—rather bad Catholics and hooligans than good Catholics and good citizens? If so, they are imitating what ought to be the deterrent example of certain Christian sects who preferred the triumph of Mahometanism to the sway of their hated Christian rivals. They had their way, and those districts in the East of Europe are Mahometan to this day. How stands the account of those so-called Christians with the genius of Christianity? And if Dr. Clifford succeeds in enlarging the sphere and influence of irreligion in England rather than allow room for the form of Christian

religion he dislikes, how shall he escape the doom of him who causes not one only, but thousands upon thousands of "these little ones" to offend?

### IF DAY-SCHOOL EDUCATION BECOMES SECULAR, WHOS THE BLAME?

From time to time there seems to assail the minds of Free Churchmen an uneasy suspicion that the course they are pursuing is tending towards the wholesale secularisation of day-school education. Accordingly they hasten to assert that this admittedly deplorable result, if realised, will be due, not to their action, but to that of the wicked denominationalists. Men who attacked the religious teaching they disliked, and, though not a few of them preferred secular education, took up with Cowper-Templeism as a convenience, now hurl this latter at the heads of the very men who mostly drew up the schemes of religious education in the Council schools, and say—this or secular education!

But let us examine a little more closely this latest and wildest of the Nonconformist war-cries. What is the record of the party accused, and what is the record of the party accusing? By their deeds let each be judged. Those who are accused of secularising education are those who from first to last have borne witness for the cause of religious education—who during the last fifty years have spent many millions of money to ensure that day school education shall be religious and have given in that cause personal service, sympathy, and devotion beyond the price of millions—which when it beheld the children outside its own schools without Bible instruction became the principal agents in devising such a system of religious teaching as the imperfect circumstances allowed—who have attacked no man's system of religious teaching, but sought to impart the truth committed to it in the way it knows, and has fully proved—and whose only sin in the whole matter is that it declines to turn its back on its own principles and methods in order to accept in their stead a system which their opponents have picked up as a temporary expedient—an ex-

pedient which admits unbelievers to teach belief, and is as uncertain and variable in its content as it is precarious in its existence.

Now let us turn to the other side. As to the attitude of the Nonconformists of fifty years ago, I will quote an authority the Nonconformists of to-day will acknowledge. Dr. Henry Dunckley, writing in the *British Weekly* of May 24th, 1889, says: "They (the Nonconformists) laid it down as a principle that education must be religious, that some amount of dogmatic religious instruction must be given to every child as a part of the daily school course. Then came in their other distinctive principle, that State aid could not be accepted for religious teaching. They were thus cut off altogether from State assistance. But they went, or most of them did, still further. They held that it was no part of the duty of the State, or rather that it was an infraction of its duty, to provide for the education of its people."

Similarly, coming to thirty years ago, we note Dr. Dale, of Birmingham, finding a secular system implied in Nonconformist principles. For the last twenty years Dr. Robertson Nicoll tells us he has been convinced that the "secular solution" is the only just one. In Wales, where Nonconformity is relatively most powerful and earnest, was to be found the largest proportion of Board schools in which no religious teaching was given. Soon after the Education Act of 1902 was passed, a United Conference and demonstration of North Wales Liberals and Nonconformists was held in Llandudno, at which a resolution in favour of a National System of Secular Education was passed. Many Liberationists find secular education involved in their Liberationism. As Mr. Beriah Evans said in recommending a secular policy to the local Congregational Union at Bangor: "We cannot protest against Established Religion to one class of the population, while supporting Established Religion to another class.

If we order an Established Religion for the children in the schools, if we unite that Religion with the State through the County Councils, and if we endow it from local rates, what force is there

in our right to disestablish and disendow the Church of England?"

All the great Nonconformist bodies have declared for passive resistance, of which the basal principle is that no one must be compelled to contribute towards religious teaching to which he conscientiously objects. As there is no religious teaching imaginable which does not infringe the conscience of some, secular education is involved in passive resistance.

A few months ago the President of the Baptist Union, in his official sermon, declared that it was "not just to unbelievers" to compel them to pay towards religious teaching. At the 1907 meeting of the Free Church Council, the chairman, Dr. Rendel Harris, declared that if the Government proposed a plan of secular education, it would, in his opinion, be impossible to carry a vote against it in that assembly. When one ardent spirit wished a vote to be taken on the subject, the chairman, probably for tactical reasons, refused to put the motion to the meeting. It would be possible to multiply proofs indefinitely, but I will only add that the Northern Counties Education League, in their meeting at the Midland Hotel, Manchester, pronounced in favour of a secular system.

It requires no small audacity on the part of religious bodies so infected with the principles of secular education in public day-schools to lay the charge of secularism at the door of those who have never wavered in their support of religious education. But on the point of audacity the breaking strain of the Nonconformist Conscience has yet to be reached. Whence comes the Cowper-Templeism which they are now taking to their hearts? Were they the authors of the scheme? Nothing of the kind. The religious destitution of the children in Board schools did not stir them to action. The religious instruction in those schools was mainly the work of Churchmen. Dr. Clifford admitted (*Times*, January 8th, 1907) that Cowper-Templeism was introduced by Anglicans in 1870 against the will of Free Churchmen. The Nonconformist members of School Boards were mostly either

indifferent or hostile to its introduction. In Manchester Canon Nunn took a leading part in devising the local plan, but only one of the six "Unsectarian" members supported him (the Rev. Dr. McKerrow). Mr. W. Warburton, a passive resister of nearly forty years ago, poured contempt on the scheme. The chairman of the Board, Mr. Herbert Birley, was a staunch Churchman, while Dr. John Watts, a leading Unsectarian member of the Board, had at one time been a "Freethought" lecturer. It was in allusion to these facts that Mr. Warburton scornfully called the religious scheme of the Manchester School Board the "Birley-cum-Watts Mixture." What would that sturdy old Nonconformist have said if he had lived to see his brethren adopt as the Nonconformist Best what the Church had devised for schools other than her own as confessedly a subsidiary and inferior article? His amazement would have been greater still to see modern Nonconformists attempting to browbeat Churchmen and Roman Catholics into accepting this system as the one established and endowed form of religious teaching in the day schools of the land. He would possibly have turned the words of Mr. Hollowell against him and his friends, and advised him and them to "try the superb tactics of honesty." We should not then see the sorry spectacle of Dr. Massie telling his co-religionists that he was at heart in favour of the Secular-Thorough, but that as to be loyal to principle would mean allowing Mr. Balfour to "sweep the country," they must fall back on the "Cowper-Temple-Thorough." When once Dr. Massie and his friends have got Anglican and Roman Catholic teaching out of the way, with what zeal would they defend Cowper-Templeism from the assaults of its foes? In all likelihood with as much heart as the mother of the dead child in Solomon's judgment displayed for the living child she was prepared to see sacrificed to her false claim. No, the real choice for denominationalists is between the living child of distinctive religious teaching or the dead child of pure secularism. The half-alive, half-dead system of Cowper-Templeism, which contains within it the seeds of inevitable corruption and decay, presents no valid

alternative. To destroy denominational teaching in order to set up universal Cowper-Templeism would be to erect a building when all practicable foundation was removed. The hour of its apparent triumph would sound the stroke of its doom. It would be the reverse of the old gladiatorial utterance, *Morituri te salutamus*. Rather as the champions of Nonconformity appeared in the circus to hail the queen of their recent affection (the genius of Cowper-Templeism), would it be fitting for them to address her with the salute: *Morituram te salutamus*.

Enough has, I hope, been said to show how ridiculously untrue to fact is the charge that if secular education is eventually adopted, the fault will lie with denominationalists. These latter have fostered religious education in their own schools, and led no attack on religious education outside them. Their opponents, on the contrary, have originated no plan of religious teaching, but violently attacked one which has held its ground for half a century. It is not for those who would fain strike a fatal blow to accuse others of murderous designs. The charge is as ridiculous as it is unjust.

#### THE ROOT OF THE NONCONFORMIST DIFFICULTY.

The leaders of the Free Churches tell us that they represent half the nation. How, then, does their record of voluntary service to the cause of day-school education compare with that of the other half? True, the Wesleyans at one time had a fair number of day schools under their control, but largely owing to the influence of the late Rev. H. P. Hughes, a policy of school closing and school transfer has succeeded to a policy of school opening. The Roman Catholics alone, one of the poorest of religious bodies in England, has a larger record of personal and financial effort to show than the churches of Dr. Clifford and Mr. Hollowell combined. As for the Church of England, the very magnitude of its sacrifices in the past in the cause of national education is almost regarded as the measure of its offence by Free Church critics. But outsiders judge more fairly, and the tale of solid work in the educational field which stands to the credit of the

Anglican and Roman Catholic churches weighs strongly with the general public.

But not only does the superior record of denominationalists in the past accredit their side in the controversy and embarrass the other—there is the further and present fact that those two churches have at command a larger store of personal interest and personal devotion which can be turned at will into educational channels. Dr. Clifford, Mr. Hollowell, and Mr. Lidgett do not desire the “right of entry,” for they and their friends have no desire to do the inglorious and self-sacrificing work of personally giving religious instruction in the public day schools.

The fact that Free Churchmen can fall back on no fund of educational zeal in their denominations at all comparable with that displayed by English Churchmen and Roman Catholics in the past and ready to be evoked in the future, accounts for two noteworthy features in each and every scheme of national day school education which finds favour with the Free Church Council. The leaders of that body desire a scheme which (1) makes no financial demands on them over and above the compulsory exactions to which all must respond. All must contribute equally with themselves towards the one method they wish to impose on all, including many who conscientiously object to it; and which (2) makes no appeal to them for personal effort in the schools on their own part. Hence “the right of entry” does not commend itself to them. They know that Anglicans and Roman Catholics would as easily surpass them in assiduous personal service as they themselves outdo these rivals when educational zeal is measured by the fierceness of mere platform utterances on the subject. Whatever religious teaching or observance is ordained must on their plan be given by members of the teaching staff, but no account is to be taken of their fitness for that particular task. The most important subject of the school programme is religiously to be left to the chapter of accidents, whilst the training colleges which have done most in the past to raise the religious teaching in Council schools to whatever degree

of efficiency it may have reached, are to be robbed of the very element which has tended most to thoroughness in that sphere.

### A BUNGLED CASE.

Not fifty years of discussion and protest have sufficed to clarify the views of the Nonconformists and unite them on one common ground of action. Their principles and professions point to secular education, but the admitted unpopularity of that measure deters many of their number from advocating it. Hence there is no common principle clearly ascertained, firmly held, and consistently stated. Their views are in a state of flux. With regard to religious education, their aim is mainly negative. They are more concerned to thwart Anglicans and Roman Catholics than to promote any positive scheme of their own. To be negative and destructive rather than positive and constructive condemns them to controversial impotence. Free Churchmen ask that Parliament shall ignore the educational labours and sacrifices of half a century, and start again with a clean slate. But it is the habit of the English people to proceed by way of evolution rather than of revolution. If we were starting a new nation we should scarcely set up a royal family, but yet the vast majority of Englishmen would deem it madness to throw away the advantages of our historic monarchy. So, too, it would be a folly to cast into the melting-pot that denominational system of education under which so much good work has been done in the past, and which has won so high a place in the affections of the common people. The Nonconformist leaders have so bungled their case that in the coming struggle the mere statement of their battle-cries sounds like a pledge of their defeat. Just as in the anti-brewer agitation, Free Churchmen stood for class persecution and disability, and left it to their opponents to pick their old flag out of the gutter, with its inspiring motto—Equal civic rights for all, irrespective of trade or class or creed, so on the education question the Free Church Council declares that parents have no rights in their children's education except as voters,

leaving to the other side to maintain the right of parents, as parents, to control their children's religious education. Again, they cry out for a sort of educational Act of Uniformity—one type of State-recognised school, and only one, must be tolerated, leaving their opponents to plead for that diversity and variety in education which are so conducive to the real welfare of the schools. Then, too, they propose to establish and endow the particular form of religious teaching which satisfies them, and that only, the whole expense to be borne by the State, including millions who are not satisfied with it, thus leaving to the other side the battle-cry of equal rights for all in the nation's schools. Did ever any great party so completely turn its back on its principles and its past history and present to its opponents war-cries which are the sure pre-sage of victory?

Speaking of State schools and State officials, Sir John Gorst says:—"It is enough to observe here that, as compared with the work of a private person like Dr. Barnardo, its education of the children in its charge has proved a lamentable failure, and that the chief cause of this failure is the absence, perhaps unavoidable, from State institutions of that special individual love for each child which Nature implants in a mother. This is the most powerful and essential influence that can be brought to bear upon a child, and free education and free feeding tend to diminish, if not to obliterate it." The proposals of Free Churchmen in the matter of public education tend to augment the power of the State, with its army of officials. Years ago, thousands of men and women, not inspectors, interested themselves in elementary education, but the number is diminishing daily, and threatens to vanish. As Canon Richardson says: "No one but the bona-fide educationist knows what this loss is to real heart-training. Education is far deeper than book-work or official direction."

We have had nearly forty years of Board schools, with a very large incidental expenditure of public money. Are the moral and intellectual results satisfactory? We know they are not. The young are more frivolous and pre-co-

cious than those of a previous generation. Parents are more negligent of their children. Home life is neglected. The working man talks more of his rights as against the State than of his duties to the State. Politicians vie with each other in burning incense at the shrine of Demos. Labour has its courtiers and sycophants to-day just as king and aristocracy had in past times. Mr. Birrell laments a "slackening in the moral fibre" of the nation. Dr. Gladden warns us that in America democracy has failed to check the tendencies which are developing in this country "Instead of its being true that democracy will transfigure egoism, we have found that no form of society can march hell-ward faster than a democracy under the banner of unbridled enthusiasm." General Booth tells us to our shame that "there are no children in Japan who go to school without breakfast, and you never see children with bare feet and not decently dressed, or a woman who is not respectably covered." How different in England!

In view of facts like these, can we say that the present is the time when the nation can afford to augment the tendency we deplore by lessening the forces that tell for spirituality, for individuality, and reasonable diversity?

## THE NATIONAL FREE CHURCH COUNCIL.

---

The National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches may perhaps be called at once the product and the organ of the Nonconformist conscience. This influential body has only existed about sixteen years. It will be both interesting and enlightening to glance at the early history of the movement. The real nature of the organisation is even more apparent in the story of its formation than in the record of its deeds when formed. I have already referred in a general way to the Free Church Council and the degree of its representative character, but it is now time to come to closer grips with the question. Arithmetic, we know, will not budge. Let us then bring the matter to the test of fact and figures.

In the preface to the Free Church Year Book for 1896 we are told that "the first Congress, held in March, 1892, was a congress pure and simple; it consisted of those *individuals* who had accepted an invitation to assemble, none were present as elected representatives." Each session of this first Congress at Manchester had, we are told, a separate chairman, chosen by the committee which had called the Congress together. It is this committee, obviously self-appointed, which is the ultimate fact in the origin of the body.

At the Leeds Congress (March, 1894) there were very few representatives present from one or two denominations only, the assembly consisting in the main of personal members (*i.e.*, individuals who had accepted the invitation of the convening committee), and it had no permanent presiding officer. At this Congress a resolution was passed indicating county federations, together with united councils of churches in the larger towns, as the best basis on which to constitute a National Representative Congress.

The Birmingham Congress (March, 1895) was more representative. Dr. Berry, of Wolverhampton, had been elected president, two county federations and 68 councils

in towns were represented, and the feeling was strong that the time had come to make the change from an individually summoned congress to a permanent Council. The committee was directed to prepare a draft constitution and bring it up at the Nottingham meeting in 1896. At this gathering the Congress was constituted a Council.

#### ITS REPRESENTATIVE CLAIM.

There then existed 209 local Councils, as against 897 ten years later. In a petition addressed (March, 1896) to her late Majesty against a proposed regulation for the Island of Guernsey, the opening sentence reads: "Your petitioners represent two hundred local Councils in various towns and districts of England, and more than a million communicants and accredited members of churches."

Dividing the million communicants among 200 local councils gives an average of 5,000 communicants for each local council, which, as Euclid says, is absurd. The Free Church Year Book for 1906 gives the total number of communicants of the entire Free Churches of England as 2,136,079. If the 209 local councils of 1896 represented one million communicants, the 897 local councils of 1906 ought to represent nine millions of communicants, that is, more than four times the total number of all the adherents of all the Free Churches in the land. Which, again, is absurd.

A still more astounding claim was made at the same meeting by the president, the Rev. H. Price Hughes, M.A. He is reported (page 145) as saying that "as far as their calculations went, the representatives there that day represented at least seven millions of Christians." So that in 1896, in the days of its feebleness, the Free Church Council already represented between three and four times the total number of communicants in all the Free Churches they aspired one day to represent. Arguing proportionately, the number of Christians represented ten years later (when the local councils had increased more than fourfold) ought to have been thirty millions; which once more is absurd.

The estimates of the official Year Book have not even the quality of consistency in error. The magnifying glass through which the president viewed the Free Church figures was seven times more powerful than that employed by the secretary, the Rev. Thos. Law, for on page 127 the latter is reported as saying that in England and Wales the local councils associated with them registered, in round figures, a membership of about a million. He then gives a list of the "denominations included," among which he names "Methodists of all sections." Ten years later, after much progress in the meantime, the Rev. S. Chadwick asks his fellow Wesleyans why they "hold aloof."

Coming to claims of representative character expressed in more general terms, and which as such do not so readily lend themselves to the test of arithmetic, we find (page 37) the president declaring from the chair: "We represent at this moment a majority of the English people who attend places of worship and take a real interest in Christianity." This could only be true if (1) Anglicans and Roman Catholics together were a minority of the worshipping public in England; and also (2) the Congress which spoke for only 209 local councils represented the whole of Christian England outside those two churches. Of these the former is doubtful, the latter is demonstrably false. For arrogance of assumption the case is not quite so outrageous as that of the three tailors of Tooley Street with their "We, the people of England," but it goes some considerable distance in their direction.

On the same page the flight of Mr. Hughes's imagination carries him beyond the seas. He says: "Representing a majority of the people at home, we represent an immense majority in the British Empire, and an overwhelming majority in the English-speaking world."

The President said (page 27): "Our desire is not to collect a mere mass meeting of enthusiastic adherents or partisans, but to bring together a carefully-selected, representative, and responsible assembly to deliberate seriously, and also to express the convictions of the millions of Christians whom we practically represent." The qualifying adverb "practically" seems to suggest that

even Mr. Hughes had a sort of sub-conscious sense of the extravagance of his claims.

On page 24 he is reported as saying that "this national gathering has already become an Ecclesiastical Parliament of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and Wales." He also speaks of the "fathers and confessors and martyrs of the world-wide churches we represent."

Mr. Hughes (pages 31-3) quotes with approval the definition of the Catholic Church given by St. Ignatius in his letter to the Smyrnaeans: "Wherever Christ Jesus may be, there is the Catholic Church," and proceeds: "Agreeing with that venerable Apostolic Father, taking our stand upon that truly Scriptural definition, we look around us, and find that the Catholic Church in this country is divided into three great groups—the Roman Catholics, the Anglican Catholics, and the Scriptural Catholics. Each of these three groups has its own distinctive form of unity. The Roman Catholics are one in the Pope and in nothing else.

We come now to the Anglican Catholics. In what sense are they one? Contemplating the facts dispassionately and historically, it is impossible to deny that the Anglican Church is one in the Crown, and in nothing else.

When the Anglican Church is disestablished here, as in Ireland, it will be no longer one in the Crown, but one in the Episcopate. I come now to Scriptural Catholics, the group which we represent. We are not one in the Pope. We are not one in the Crown. But we are one in Christ. The Roman Catholic stands for the supremacy of the Pope, the Anglican Catholic for the supremacy of the Crown, and the Scriptural Catholics for the supremacy of the Christ. That is our point of union, and we realise it more and more."

Mr. Percy Bunting assured the Council that they possessed the note of authority. "It was natural," he said, "for the young to look for some authority." He rather hazily defined authority (page 136) as "a reinforcement of the early convictions which came from the concurrence of many," as if the power to stand were derived from the numbers of those who leaned against one another. He went on to say that "authority was, in their

view, the totality of Christian experience. They were trying to make that great movement which would in a proper sense have authority—an authority upon which they could lean.

There they represented the power of the doctrine of the Christian Church straight in one line through Apostles and martyrs. Let them beware how they slighted the authority of the Church of their generation, and to those who appealed to them they could present an authority on which they might rest." If the claim thus advanced on behalf of the Free Church Council holds good, it ought to supersede that of the separate denominations, which it is not held to do. I have already shown that the figures quoted by them in their claims of numerical representation are absurdly inflated, and will not bear a moment's examination. Perhaps some of my readers may take leave to correct in their own minds the exaggerated claims advanced by Messrs. Hughes and Bunting. Obviously one need not go outside the ranks of the Free Churches to find Popes, both clerical and lay. In the two utterances just quoted the lay Pope runs the clerical Pope a very hard race in extravagance and arrogance of claim.

It is hard to see how certain groups of certain Free Churches coming together can claim the authority of a church in their collective capacity, when the separate churches of which these groups continue to form a part maintain their distinct existence. Mr. Bunting himself is both a member of the "Wesleyan Methodist Church" and of the Free Church Council. Does he indulge in the luxury of being a member of two churches, both possessing authority? Writing in 1904 (Introduction to Official Handbook of the Annual Meeting of the National Free Church Council at Newcastle), Mr. Bunting suggests (page 9) a less exalted motive as having originated that body. "The time therefore seemed ripe for feeling the way for a more active co-operation of the Free Churches, and while the Anglican Establishment was necessarily left out of consideration, *the very predominance and separateness of that church seemed to make it the more important for the Free Churches to come together*" From

these words it seems that the Free Church Council was formed partly at least as a counterpoise to the Established Church rather than from a purely spiritual impulse.

### IS IT A CAUCUS?

Let us turn now from our examination of its representative character on the numerical and spiritual sides to a study of its organisation. Beginning *de novo*, the Council will in its framework objectify its spirit. Freedom will be the note of this organisation of the Free Churches. All trace of an oligarchical spirit will be absent from the chosen home of this spiritual democracy. Let us see.

Speaking at the Birmingham meeting of the Free Church National Council in 1906, Mr. Stead, in what was intended as a complimentary reference, called the general secretary, the Rev. Thomas Law, the "Schnadhorst" of the movement. Mr. Law reproduced the remark in his official report, so that we may take him as accepting the view of Mr. Stead. Now, as everybody knows, Mr. Schnadhorst was the central wirepuller of a great political caucus. Does Mr. Law consider that he is the central wirepuller of another great caucus—call it religio-political or politico-religious as you please? We shall find Mr. Stead's illuminating word not unhelpful in our study of the Free Church Council organisation.

In examining the origins of that body one feels that at the back of it all, in the dark as it were, are what Mr. Hughes calls "the promoters of that Congress." This is the potent and masterful group which appears to determine all the overt movements which take place. It was they who invited the first Congress to Manchester in 1892, and although a representative element was gradually developed, it was not until the Nottingham meeting in 1896 that a constitution was drawn up. It is worth noting that at the time Mr. Hughes was claiming that the movement represented at least seven million Christians, not a single free election of the general committee had been permitted by the ruling group. On page 212 we have the record of the election of officers for the ensuing year

other than the president and the organising secretary. Here follows a list of thirty members—fifteen ministers and fifteen laymen. These names were presented to the meeting *en bloc*, and accepted by it, practically at the dictation of the committee. The President said (page 213) "he would point out that this was the last time the committee would ever be elected in that way. Under the new constitution the committee would be submitted to the ballot, and if any member of the Council wished to add any additional names, he would have the opportunity of doing so." The new constitution referred to had been passed the previous day. It was therefore in force, but suffered suspension for a year in its most important feature at the will of the dominant group whom Mr. Hughes styled the "promoters of that Congress." Thus for five years, from 1892 to 1897, there was no free election in the assembly of the Free Churches. It is worth noting that although the ratio of laymen to ministers in their own statistics was as 220 to one, yet the number of ministers elected was to equal that of laymen. The cloven foot of "clericalism" appears here. Moreover, these thirty members were empowered to select by co-optation twenty additional members—ten ministers and ten laymen. Co-optation suggests unwillingness to face the results of a free election. It is a caucus method, and the insistence on half the supplementary members being clerics points to a clerical caucus. The whole method seems most ingeniously devised to keep all power in the hands of a ruling clique. The Nonconformist bench of bishops in the Free Church Council attacks "clericalism," and exemplifies it.

In 1906, in addition to the twenty-five ministers and twenty-five laymen chosen on the Council, partly by ballot and partly by co-optation, there were as past presidents, treasurers, etc., ten ministers and three laymen, giving a decided preponderance of ministers over laymen. In this Nonconformist House of Lords the spiritual peers outnumber the temporal peers. The three laymen just referred to were the treasurers of the Council, to whom the clerics generously remitted all financial responsibility

Perhaps there is nothing in the whole transaction which more stamps the procedure as essentially of a caucus character than the fact that when the new constitution was voted at Nottingham, the President said that he had great pleasure in moving the adoption of that constitution *en bloc*. The manner in which the constitution was hustled and hustled through was most significant of the formal nature of the business. The passage and discussion of the new constitution were presented on a Wednesday afternoon, sandwiched between the Secretary's report on the organisation and an important resolution on Education to be introduced by Mr. Hollowell. The Secretary gave the assembly a pretty broad hint that not much discussion was possible or desirable. The official report says (page 142): "The Rev Thos. Law said it was now past four o'clock, and they had the important education resolution before them. There ought to be some time for something in the way of discussion on this question; therefore he would content himself by formally seconding the resolution." The phrase "some time for something in the way of discussion" is exceedingly suggestive. Mr. Hollowell, with his resolution on the education question, must not be kept long waiting over such a trifle as what ought to be the Magna Charta of the Council. Nor, indeed, was he, for no discussion worthy of the name took place. One gentleman uttered a mild protest against "the great power vested in the Committee," and pointed out that under the new constitution "it was just possible that most important matters might be settled by half a dozen gentlemen." But he received little encouragement, and after a single amendment on a single paragraph of a single clause had been put forward and rejected, the original motion adopting the constitution "was carried unanimously," and the way was clear for Mr. Hollowell to demonstrate how absolutely free is the Council's platform from all trace of political and sectarian rancour.

#### A CONTRADICTION.

On page 137 the President, Mr. Hughes, is reported as saying that "they were not going to consider for the first

time their constitution and certain fundamental doctrinal and ecclesiastical principles. These were determined before they met in Manchester, and they represented the sentiments of many churches that came together on that occasion." Now, as the Manchester meeting was the first ever held, we have here the strange admission that the constitution had been determined before any public meeting whatever had been held in connection with the movement. In other words, a handful of self-appointed men ("the promoters of that Congress," as Mr. Hughes elsewhere called them) went to the first Congress with its future constitution in their pockets. This is caucus work and clericalism in sweet combination. When Mr. Hughes went on to say that "many churches came together on that occasion," he speaks in flat contradiction of the words of Dr. Mackennal, who states in the preface to the Year Book for 1896: "The first Congress, held in Manchester in 1892, was a Congress pure and simple; it consisted of those who had accepted an invitation to assemble; none were present as elected representatives." Thus we have Mr. Hughes stating that at Manchester churches came together, while Dr. Mackennal says that only individuals as individuals met there. The one implies a representative character, which the other expressly denies. Only the following year did the first nucleus of representation emerge. In Dr. Mackennal's words: "When they met in Manchester it was actually proposed at one time that they should move no resolution at all, so little responsibility did they feel entitled to assume as representing anybody but themselves. It was determined that the *next Congress should be summoned on somewhat of a representative basis.*"

One of the most interesting (and I might add amusing) passages in the Year Book for 1896 is that in which Mr. Hughes, as president, explains away the somewhat undemocratic fact that the right of nominating his successor was retained in the hands of the president himself. "They were," he said, "a democratic assembly, and somebody might hastily imagine that that might involve the necessity of submitting the name of the presiding officer to

the ballot. He wanted to explain how absolutely impossible that was. The ballot was not an idol that they fell down and worshipped. It was a painful necessity arising from the existence of sin in the world. In any case it was only a means to an end. The object was to get the most capable man. Not one of the responsible representatives of the churches whom, in the future, they would wish to see in the chair of a movement like that would ever consent to have their claims canvassed in the presence of the reporters, or to be pitted against one another in the election of President. There was no alternative in a dignified assembly to leaving it practically to the committee." After some further remarks, Mr. Hughes nominated his successor, and in the words of the official report, "asked the Council to signify its assent to the nomination which he made on behalf of a unanimous committee by rising." The Council did as requested, the President remarking: "I thank you." It is not everywhere that autocratic leaders find such docile followers.

Having thus seen how the nomination to the Presidential chair is confined to the ruling group, we next note that the treasurers and secretaries are to be elected by the Annual Council *on the nomination of the Executive Committee*. Another regulation which seems well calculated to keep the directing power in the hands of the old party leaders reads: "The Executive Committee shall be elected by ballot from persons *nominated by the Executive Committee of the previous year*, or by not less than three representative members of the Council. Thus the consentient action of at least three members is required before a single candidate can be nominated to compete with the nominees of the old committee. Even the right of free discussion in the Annual Council is held subject to the will of the Executive Committee. The rule under this head reads: "Suggested constitutional amendments and all notices of motion must be approved by the Executive Committee as suitable for discussion before they can be presented to the Annual Council." At the Council for 1907, Dr. Rendel Harris, as president, refused to allow a vote to be taken on a proposal for secular education. He had previously declared that if the Government pro-

posed a system of purely secular education it would, in his opinion, be impossible to carry a vote in its favour in that gathering. However that may be, the free expression of opinion was remorselessly gagged in an assembly of Free Churchmen.

#### AN OLIGARCHY.

We have shown to how large an extent the ministerial caste prevails in the Executive Committee. Where we should antecedently have expected the rights of the laity to be fully admitted, free election to be proclaimed, and free discussion to be encouraged, we find a group of clerics assuming authority in the first instance, and then hedging round their power with safeguard after safeguard as if to secure that in no eventuality should it pass out of their hands—presenting executive committees for five years in succession, to be accepted *en bloc*—putting through a new constitution on the same plan, employing in their own constitution that principle of co-optation which they condemn in the sphere of elementary education administration and reserving to the Central Council the power to stifle discussion on any subject the discussion of which may be deemed inconvenient to the powers that be. Sir Compton Ricketts, M.P., recently stated from the chair of the Congregational Union that “Congregational principles are democratic, but they are often concealed under oligarchic practices.” The remark might with equal justice be extended to the Free Church Council. Under its wing a handful of men direct an organisation which is supposed to represent half of Christian England. Sometimes the oligarchy crystallises for the moment into an autocracy, and we have Dr. Clifford speaking with all the authority of a Free Church Pontiff and, whilst railing at the bishops, seeking to exercise a power to which they would never venture to aspire.

A system under which a few ministerial leaders engross almost the whole platform is a striking anomaly in a professedly democratic body. Now and again two or three ministers from the undistinguished crowd are allowed a platform opportunity, and if they respond with ability

they are hailed as men "discovered," and take their place among the great men of the Council whose names are a sure "draw" to a Free Church audience. The tendency of the Free Churches to man-worship of this kind was noted by Dr. Horton at the close of his year of office as president in 1906. He says: "Certain names are apt to be used as baits to attract great audiences, and reliance is placed on these magnetic personalities, instead of on the truth of the cause and on the sufficiency of God. Where there is one of the few popular names there is a crowd. The cause, the principle, God Himself, cannot be trusted, unless a popular name is on the platform. In the absence of such a name, the people do not come, and the tendency to make men who have not the popular gift feel unappreciated, or even depreciated, is a serious loss to the churches. A great crowd drawn to hear a popular speaker has no more lasting significance than a great crowd drawn to hear Paderewski or Sarah Bernhardt. That we are losing sight of this, and making our Free Church Council work turn on a broken pivot, is my one anxiety after my year's experience." Wise and faithful words, but will they be heeded?

## THE FREE CHURCH CATECHISM.

---

The evolution of the Free Church Catechism furnishes yet another example of the loose ideas of representation which prevail in Free Church Council circles. In 1896, the General Committee of the Free Church Council undertook the preparation of a new Catechism. In the explanatory note prefixed to this Catechism, we are told that the Rev. Principal Dykes, D.D., was requested to compile a Draft Catechism, and a preliminary committee, "representing the associated churches," was appointed to revise that draft in consultation with Dr. Dykes. In what way did the preliminary committee "represent the associated churches"? The bare fact is that ten persons were selected by the Council at their pleasure, and it was then assumed that they represented the churches of which they were individually members. Thus Mr. Hughes in his sole person spoke for the Wesleyan body. His representative character was, of course, a pure assumption. When the main work of compiling the Catechism was done, ten more members were added to the ten of the original committee to make a final revision of the work. And it is for a catechism framed in this personal and unrepresentative fashion that Mr. Hughes, the "Chairman and convener" of the Catechism Committee, claims that "the theologians who have prepared this Catechism represent, directly or indirectly, the beliefs of not less, and probably many more, than sixty millions of avowed Christians in all parts of the world." Never did Mr. Hughes give a more remarkable specimen of that megalomania from which he and his colleagues of the Free Church Council habitually suffered.

### A POWERFUL BAPTIST ELEMENT.

We all know that it is a Baptist minister, Dr. Clifford, who is generally regarded as the most influential member of the Free Church National Council. It was to him that a present of £6,000 was recently made. It is a Baptist, the Rev. F. B. Meyer, who has been appointed the first

ministerial agent to visit the various federations and local councils on behalf of the Central Council, and in the preliminary committee appointed to prepare the new catechism three out of the members were Baptists, no other religious body being so largely represented. The Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Primitive Methodists had two members each, the Wesleyan Methodists only one.

As Baptists only recognise the immersion of adult believers, whilst nearly all the other dissenting bodies practise infant baptism, I was curious to see how such divergent views were reconciled in the Free Church Catechism, especially as Mr. Hughes, the chairman and convener, states in a prefatory note that "every question and every answer in this Catechism has been finally adopted without a dissentient vote." On turning to page 21 we find the following:—

Question: What is the visible sign in the sacrament of baptism?

Answer: Water, wherein the person is baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Here the word *wherein* clearly points to immersion, and excludes sprinkling or pouring. If these latter modes were intended to be recognised, we should rather expect the phrase, "*wherewith the person is baptized.*"

The next question and answer point in the same direction:—

Question: What inward benefits does this signify?

Answer: The washing away of sin and the new birth wrought by the Holy Spirit in all who repent and believe.

As unconscious babes cannot possibly repent or believe, and the inward benefits of baptism are in the above answer apparently limited to those who do repent and believe, infant baptism is unrecognised, if not implicitly condemned. The baptism of children becomes a meaningless rite, and the lambs of Christ's flock are left to the uncovenanted mercies.

It is plain, then, that the view of baptism taken in the Free Church Catechism involves a complete surrender to

the Baptist position on the part of the Paedobaptists. Where is the representative character of the Catechism on this point? To misrepresent is not to represent. Baptists do not compose one-fourth of the Christians for whom the Council professes to speak, yet the view on baptism held by a minority over-rides the view held by the great majority. The three Baptist members of the original committee appointed to draft the Catechism are to be congratulated on the excellent denominational use they made of the over-representation of their body on that committee. Of course we know that the question of baptism is primary for Baptists. To it they attach so much importance as to make it a ground of ecclesiastical separation from churches with which in belief and church order they are in general agreement. They have a perfect right to publish their characteristic views and express them in catechetical or other form, but they have no right to impose them on a body which as a whole rejects them. A sectional view should not be paraded as the general view. Dr. Rendel Harris, President of the Council for 1907-8, is a member of the Society of Friends, and as such rejects both sacraments. The Free Church Catechism misrepresents the views of an ex-president of the Free Church Council.

#### GROWTH OF THE POLITICAL ELEMENT.

Where the personnel of the leaders and members is so largely of one political colour that any of their meetings might be converted from a professed Free Church Council meeting into a Liberationist gathering or a demonstration in favour of passive resistance, or a Liberal convention, and that with scarcely the change of a man, it is inevitable that the political side should assert itself more and more. And as political activity is more concrete, more showy, more immediately effective in appearance than deeper spiritual work, the tendency is for the lean kine of partisan activity to swallow up the fat kine of spiritual culture. In the report for 1896 it is stated (page 129) that after an united mission of the Free Churches in Birmingham, a leading minister said: "Now that we have come together for spiritual work, we shall be prepared for any united

effort for the glory of God and the salvation of man." Under such specious pleas as this the bridge is built by which the combined Free Churches pass from united "spiritual work" to common political and other activities which are confessedly outside spiritual work, but which are construed to be religious in character by the plausible device of blurring the distinction between religious and secular work. A Wesleyan minister, writing in the *Methodist Recorder* of March 14th, 1907, states that a superintendent minister in London was asked to join a Free Church Local Council. He found that it could discuss any subject, political or otherwise, if a three-fourths majority agreed. On such a movable basis he declined to join the council.

As far back as 1903 the National Council decided to raise a fund for a Parliamentary Election Campaign. What was called a Motor Campaign, in which Dr. Clifford and other leaders took part, was included in this election campaign. From that time the partisan character of the Free Church Council has become more and more open and undisguised. Extreme men like Dr. Clifford and Mr. Hollowell have come more to the front. Even Mr. Meyer, one of the most spiritually-minded of the leaders, is using his position as a sort of organising agent of the Council to advocate the disestablishment of the Church and the abolition of the House of Lords. He mentioned that the "existence" of that House was an objectionable relic of feudalism, so that Mr. Meyer is by his public utterances committing the Council to political courses so extreme as to be regarded even by many Liberals as revolutionary. "To end the House of Lords" is also the aim of the Rev. Silas Hocking, who, speaking at Leeds before the National Council in 1907, said:—"They would agree that few of the reforms specified were likely to be carried out unless they could end the House of Lords. He characterised that Chamber as being composed of antediluvian fossils, who breathed an atmosphere in which freedom could not live. It was a House replenished largely by plutocrats of the drink ring and of the gutter Press; a House buttressed by the heads of the Established Church—the Bench of

Bishops—that had remained true to its predatory instincts, and to its hatred of social reform.” Was ever such language heard outside of a pot-house? And it is the National Council of the Free Churches that lends its platform for these ravings, which excite the disgust of all fair-minded men.

#### ANTI-ANGLICAN BIAS.

When the Anglo-French understanding became a fact the German press complained that the apparently defensive combination had an aggressive side in relation to their own country. However that may be, there can be no doubt that the “alliance of the Free Churches” has an edge directed against the Church of England. I will cite a few evidences of this feeling from the first official record of the Council’s transactions, that for the year 1896. Mr. R. W. Perks, M.P., speaking of Churchmen, said “he dared say some of them were glad enough when Nonconformists had gone to their last reward.” The Rev. J. H. Hollowell, speaking on the education question said (page 149): “The supreme aim of the Anglican system was not to give a broad moral, and intellectual education. The supreme aim was to teach that the Nonconformist churches were no churches, that their ministers were no ministers, that their ordinances were impertinent and irregular, that their dearest fellowship was a schism, and that the State Church was the only authorised society of God’s people.” The deliverance from which these words are extracted was described by Mr. Hughes as “a most dignified and statesmanlike speech.” The platform and machinery of the Free Church Council are used by Mr. Hollowell to propagate this irreconcilable attitude in education which more than anything else has prevented, and still prevents, a settlement of the question on reasonable lines. The secretary’s report states (page 131) that “the machinery having been prepared is now being well used by the Rev. J. Hirst Hollowell and others.” This was in 1896, we are now in 1908. Where has this harsh, malicious, and uncompromising spirit landed Free Churchmen?

Skipping ten years and coming to the report for 1906,

we find the old bitter spirit still surviving. Mr. W. T. Stead is reported as saying (page 32) that "his greatest objection to the Church of England was not its establishment, but that it was not a national church. It had not a glimmer of an idea of its duties to the nation." He added, with a characteristic personal touch, that the Bishop of Birmingham had lost a great opportunity when he omitted to invite the National Council to the Cathedral for a great "Te Deum."

In his presidential address, to his honour be it said, the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett had put in a plea for Christian conciliation and for "a large spirit of patience and forbearance in securing a settlement of the education controversy."

The Rev. F. B. Meyer also did himself credit by making the admission that "a large body of Churchmen, ecclesiastics, bishops, and others have had an exalted ideal of education, and have sought to carry it out with magnanimity and earnestness for our country's welfare. We all of us have perhaps said more than was consistent with Christian charity now and again, about the sectarian aspect of their care for education." But four other speakers referred to the president's plea in a far different spirit. Dr. Clifford said: "We are told to be magnanimous! We have no difficulty in that. Free Churchmen have been trained in magnanimity. Suffering is the badge of all our tribe." He then, with unconscious self-revelation, went on to show that his idea of magnanimity to an opponent was to make no concession to his views, but to force your own on him without modification. His words were: "We will not accept conclusions which are compromises." The Clifford idea of magnanimity is getting all your own way.

Mr. W. Howell Davies, M.P., said that "they as Free Churchmen were magnanimous. Therein was their danger." Mr. Davies proceeded frankly to assume the political aspect of the Council by saying "He hoped the influence of that great gathering would do very much to strengthen the Government party in the House of Commons and to strengthen the Government itself."

Mr. Hollowell resented the President's exhortation.

"It was easy," he said, "to cultivate a reputation for magnanimity among the oppressors, but it was far better to win the gratitude of the oppressed. He saw no reason why they should be lectured about moderation."

It was reserved for the Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon to give the finishing touch in the following words: "They must not sail under false colours. They wanted to be courteous, but they must not be mealy-mouthed. They must make it clear what Nonconformity meant, and Nonconformity had always meant Disestablishment. *To compromise principles which they held in trust was one aspect of the sin against the Holy Ghost.*"

#### SOME FORMS OF PERSECUTION EMPLOYED BY FREE CHURCHMEN.

"Fair and sound dealing," says Bacon, "is the glory of a man." We might add that it is equally the glory of a party or of a cause, just as unfair dealing is the disgrace of those who resort to it. My complaint against Free Churchmen is that they have not dealt out justice to their opponents.

After the Education Bill of 1902 had passed through the House of Commons, Mr. Balfour astonished Mr. Lloyd George by warmly congratulating him on the high ability he had displayed in his criticism of the measure. He closed his remarks with the statement that Mr. Lloyd George had displayed all the qualities of a great Parliamentarian. This generous tribute to an opponent evidently made a great impression on the Welsh leader, for even in the course of his campaign against the Act he found time to say that "this measure, he was glad to say, had been under the charge of one of the most chivalrous leaders the House of Commons had ever seen." Would that the spirit herein displayed were the rule and not the exception. The customary attitude of the Free Church Council is more accurately reproduced by Dr. Aked, who linked in close association the name of the devil with that of Mr. Balfour, or by Dr. Clifford, when he saved himself the necessity of answering Mr. Balfour's reasoned letter in vindication of the Act by declaring it to be "hollow and insincere." Religious leaders who adopt such irreligious

methods are obviously possessed by the very spirit of persecution. Few Parliamentary measures have been more misrepresented than the Education Act of 1902. I happened to be at Ilkley during the General Election of 1906, and saw a placard which represented John Bull standing before the entrance to a denominational school, on the door of which was a notice, "For head and assistant teacherships in this school no Nonconformist need apply." This placard was one of many thousands distributed from headquarters in London by a committee of which Mr. Birrell was the chairman. Those who saw the placard naturally concluded that the effect of Mr. Balfour's Act was to close doors of admission to teacherships which had previously been open, whereas the fact was that it opened the vast majority of those which had been closed, and closed none that had been open. The truth of the matter emerged when Dr. Macnamara, in an interview with a representative of the "Tribune" in 1906, said, in reference to a certain proposed amendment of Mr. Birrell's bill: "It would no doubt free something like 14,000 head teachers from religious tests, but it would mean a very effective religious test upon five or six times as many assistant teachers of one sort or another. And, curiously enough, it would reimpose upon those teachers the very test which the Balfour Act of 1902 practically removed." Misrepresentation of the kind herein exposed is not a legitimate weapon of controversy. A Parliamentary majority got by such means is obtained by false pretences. It is a form of persecution to falsely accuse another of persecution.

I have already shown that individual passive resisters have displayed an intolerant spirit, and that the principle on which the movement is based excludes the possibility of religious education being given in State-aided schools, but there is yet another aspect in which it shows as a persecuting force. By taking the initiative in passive resistance its advocates took an unfair advantage of their opponents by exploiting the sympathy of the public which went out almost unquestioningly to those who posed before them in the attitude of martyrs to religious conviction. If the intolerance of Mr. McKenna's bill should unhappily

drive Roman Catholics or others into resistance and Englishmen are compelled to choose between two classes of resisters, it is scarcely likely that public sympathy will declare itself against those who have worked most and spent most in the cause of public education. A poor Irish labourer contributing out of his scanty earnings some pence weekly in Saturday night collections, in order to maintain the Catholic school dear to his heart, makes a much more moving figure than Dr. Clifford, whose denomination has made no corresponding voluntary sacrifices for public education, but who has personally been gratified with a purse of six thousand pounds in recognition of his noble efforts to deprive those who differ from him of the schools of their choice.

Another form of persecution is the general charge of proselytism brought against denominational schools. Such a charge is a breach of the ninth commandment, as every practical teacher knows. Church schools are frequently used by Nonconformists where Council schools are equally available, and in some cases even more conveniently situated. The religious difficulty is more a platform than a school difficulty. "Quartus," writing in the *Manchester Guardian*, quotes the words of a clerk to a large county authority, who said that "he could not recall any instance in which proselytism had taken place in any Church school; the children who came Dissenters left as Dissenters." I think this will be the testimony of those who know the facts. Two points should be noted in this connection. Firstly, that any general charge of proselytism in the schools implies an indictment of the teachers in those schools, a charge the very breadth of whose scope condemns it; and secondly, there are in every town and village scores of eager Dissenting champions only too ready to exploit for partisan purposes any isolated act of proselytism which may occur, and to represent a rare and exceptional case as if it were the general rule.

The charges which do get into print have been frequently proved to be mere inventions, and the majority of them ring false in the ears of a practical educationist. As a specimen, I will take a letter signed "W W G.," which

appeared in the *British Weekly* in June, 1907. The writer complains of having had prayer-book instruction forced on his child, in spite of his known wishes in the matter, which proved to him that the Conscience Clause is often inoperative. My readers will note that the writer does not claim to have appealed to the Conscience Clause. Did he expect the Conscience Clause to "operate" without being set in operation? "His known wishes in the matter" can only refer to the known fact that he was a Dissenter, but the Conscience Clause does not say that the children of Dissenters are by that very fact excluded from the religious teaching. So that we have here a typical picture of a Nonconformist grievance—the spectacle of a man who cares so little about the matter in question that he will not write a note to the school claiming for his child exemption from the religious teaching, yet who cares so much about the matter as to write a longish letter to the *British Weekly*, in which he insinuates a shabby and disingenuous charge of persecution under "our unrighteous educational system."

Dr. Clifford, in his review of a novel written by a Nonconformist minister, reproduces that picture of English rural life which finds favour on Free Church Council platforms. He quotes his author, who puts into the vicar's mouth the words: "You see, after all, Churchmanship is more to us than general education. It is the Church first and everything else second." The curate is represented as "a disciple of the Jesuit Liguori, who turns the screw ecclesiastic the last round that it can be made to go." Dr. Clifford says that the book is "simply a true description of the working of a theory of the Church and of Church and State in the village life of England." He speaks of "the fierce contest between the zeal and subtlety and Jesuitry of the Oxford Movement on the one hand, and the straightforward frankness, broad humanity, and independence of Free Church Christianity on the other." In the picture of English village life at the beginning of the twentieth century he says: "We move amongst events which have recently stirred our nation to its depths. We are present at the uprising of the Passive Resistance agi-

tation. We are hauled before the 'great unpaid,' and see the victims of their scorn and contempt, of their rudeness and discourtesy. We see the farmer ejected from his farm and driven to Canada for the 'crime of Dissent.' The workings of the 'Conscience Clause' in State schools are laid bare, and its utter futility exposed."

On similar lines is the leading article in the *New Age* for March 14, 1907, where it is stated that the object of an association of Church people was "to make the Liberal Nonconformist a social pariah. To be a human being, an Englishman, a Christian—all this is to go for nothing. Plenty of hungry attorneys can be found to advise how far boycotting can be carried without the law being actually infringed." One wonders if the writer of this precious article foamed at the mouth as he wrote the next two sentences: "Toryism is about his bed, and about his path, and keeps a severe eye on all his doings. To accept so much as the light thrown by a lantern on a dark night from a Liberal on the same road brings his Tory master down upon him with fierce reproach." All this would be amusing if it were not so serious. Great is the responsibility of men who thus poison the springs of rural life by their wild and embittered accusations. Such men read into the hearts of their opponents the suspicion and hatred which possess their own. To be a Churchman, or even a Conservative, does not necessarily mean that a man is an ogre.

Another form of persecution consists in the assumption of lofty motives for themselves and the imputation of low motives to the other side. They alone have a sincere love of education as such; those who differ from them do so from some ulterior motive. They are "Progressives" by name, and progressive by nature. To oppose any one of their pet schemes proves that you are an "obstructionist." Does the present London County Council reject the proposal to feed necessitous school children out of the rates, preferring to appeal to voluntary effort rather than undermine parental responsibility and add to the public burdens? The *Daily News* thereupon accuses the Council of callous indifference to the sufferings of the children, heading its paragraph with the words "Let them starve."

Yet another form of persecution consists in ignoring the public services of denominationalists and reaping up acts of intolerance which took place in past generations, and, in some cases, centuries ago. When the Puritans had the upper hand in England they persecuted the Anglican Church; later on the latter returned the compliment. Is it fair for modern Dissenters to harp on the persecution some of their forefathers suffered, and ignore the persecution others of them inflicted? It is quite time that the miserable records of past oppression were consigned to oblivion. Let us set a time-limit to these tales of persecution, and see to it that we ourselves do not by our unforgetting and unforgiving spirit show that not even in the twentieth century have we learned the lesson of brotherly love and true Christian feeling.

The Free Churches are on their trial before the nation. For the moment they have a giant's strength; if they use it like a giant, tyrannously and vindictively, they will incur discredit and disgrace, from which not a century of national life will suffice to relieve them.

#### IS MR. CADBURY'S MONEY TAINTED?

##### A NONCONFORMIST CASE FOR THE NONCONFORMIST CONSCIENCE.

The practical work of the Free Church Council has depended largely for financial support on the efforts of a handful of wealthy supporters. In the list of ordinary donations and subscriptions for the year 1905-6, out of 152 contributors, four gave between them more than half the total. One of these was Mr. George Cadbury, who is stated (Year Book for 1906, page 32) to have "contributed never less than £1,200 a year to the work." Under these circumstances the Free Church Council is intimately concerned in the revelations recently made as to the servile conditions under which cocoa cultivation is carried on in the Portuguese islands of San Thomé and Príncipe, off the West Coast of Africa, from which islands Messrs. Cadbury, Fry, and Rowntree obtain raw cocoa. Negroes are recruited on the mainland in Angola to work on the plantations in the two islands above named. Speaking of the revelations made by the traveller Dr. Nevinson, the *Man-*

*chester Guardian* of November 22nd, 1907, says:—"In 1904-5 Mr. Nevinson undertook a voyage of investigation, and his book, 'A Modern Slavery,' is a terrible indictment. He visited the islands themselves, and penetrated to the hinterland of Angola, where the labour for the plantations is recruited. He found that the hapless negroes are taken against their will down to the coast along the road to Benguela, which for three hundred years has carried the slaves to the ocean and which is lined with their bleaching skeletons. At Benguela the captives enter into a 'contract' for five years, a 'contract' which they do not understand and which is an infamous farce; for there are few who can live on the plantations for five years, since the death-rate is more than 20 per cent per annum. Altogether there are, according to Mr. Nevinson, between 30,000 and 40,000 slaves in the two islands, so that the annual traffic must amount to some 7,000."

In 1905 the cocoa firms involved sent out Mr. Burt to visit the islands of San Thomé and Príncipe, as well as the districts in Angola on the mainland where the negroes are recruited. This envoy of the cocoa firms reported to his employers, according to the *Daily News* of December 16th, 1907:—

"This report established the following facts:—

1. That a large proportion of the natives of Angola who are taken to St. Thomé are shipped to the islands against their will;
2. That the good repatriation laws are a dead letter;
3. That innumerable 'offences against the person of the native' now take place, this being inevitable until labour is made free in reality and not in name only;
4. That the death rate, despite excellent treatment on the large and best-managed estates, is appalling; and,
5. That most of the mortality is due to two diseases—*anæmia* and *dysentery*—complaints that are easily developed by people in a depressed mental condition, the highest death rate being amongst newly-arrived labourers forcibly taken from their homes to work across the sea without any hope of return."

The Lisbon planters, in reply to these charges, promised certain reforms, and the British Foreign Office has the matter in hand at present.

In view of the above distressing facts set forth by the cocoa firms' own agent, it is somewhat disappointing to note the attitude of the religious press in England. The *Christian World*, under the heading "Conscience and the Cocoa Trade," says: "An interesting illustration of the way in which Christian principle may influence the conditions of commerce has just been given in the cocoa trade." All the horrors of the past and present are here ignored on the strength of a reform still in the womb of the future. The *Methodist Recorder* says: "Meanwhile, we believe our countrymen have acted in an entirely honourable and Christian way. They might have left things alone, pleading that they had no direct responsibility." The *Daily News*, in a short leader of some two dozen lines, on what it mildly calls "The Plantation Problem," says: "We are content to leave the statement in respect of cocoa cultivation by native labour, which we summarise elsewhere, to speak for itself. It is our hope that the reforms there described will prove real and final, nor can it be questioned that the British firms have exerted the strongest pressure on the planters with a view to securing this desirable end. Under these circumstances further comment at the present stage is unnecessary," etc.

Such feeble and ineffective comments as those just quoted seem somewhat inadequate. It is to be hoped that no scurrilous attacks will be made on the great Quaker cocoa firms after the fashion of those which abounded during the Chinese "slavery" agitation. The language of Dr. Clifford when in his indignation over the Congo atrocities he called King Leopold "the worst man in Europe," should find no imitators. But undoubtedly Mr. Cadbury and the other cocoa firms are on the defensive, and, quite apart from questions of reform in the future, they have to render an account to a startled public conscience for their record in the past and present. The mischief has been going on, and is still going on. No prospective re-

forms can obliterate past records. Even the meagre accounts furnished, not by critics, but by the cocoa firms themselves, on the report of their accredited agent, leave some points which call for explanation. Among these may be named the following:—

1. Since when have the cocoa firms been aware of the slavery which has been so long in existence? In plain English, how long did they do what they complain of being accused of doing, *i.e.*, “tacitly acquiesce in the production of cocoa by slaves”? This statement they call “scurrilous.” Let it then be disproved. If Mr. Cadbury can say that the recent revelations were as much news to him as to the outside public, he should say so. In the absence of express information on this point, it seems reasonable to hold that those engaged in the cocoa trade knew more about the conditions under which the raw cocoa was produced than the general public could be expected to know.
2. Mr. Fox Bourne, Secretary of the Aborigines’ Protection Society, stated in 1907 that for more than five years his society had been protesting against the state of things in the West African possessions of Portugal, and had been urging on His Majesty’s Government the duty of using its influence towards procuring their amendment, and independent action contemplated by it had merely been postponed for a short time in the hope that efforts now being made by the cocoa makers in the same direction will more satisfactorily bring about the desired reforms.

The cocoa firms had attempted to screen themselves to some extent behind the names of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines’ Protection Society by stating that they had throughout been in touch with those societies, and that they (the societies) had “concurred” with the firms in their course of action up to the present.” To this Mr. Fox Bourne replied: “The Society’s ‘concurrence’ in the present action of the cocoa manufacturers in no way countenances the existing state of things in the West African possessions of Portugal.”

If, as above stated, Mr. Bourne's society had for "more than five years" prior to 1907 been protesting to the Government against the cocoa slavery, this fact shows that in 1902 or earlier the shocking state of things then existing was not unknown in certain quarters. Were the cocoa firms directly interested less well informed? Yet it was not until 1903 that they began to make any movement in the matter. Mr. Cadbury's words are:—"The methods of recruiting the labourers employed on the cocoa plantations in San Thomé and Principe and their treatment on these islands first received our serious attention in 1903, when I visited Lisbon and had interviews with the British Minister, the Portuguese Minister of Colonies, and various influential planters. The upshot was that the latter denied the charges of permitting slavery."

Here we have Mr. Cadbury apparently investigating matters as if in complete ignorance of facts which were so notorious in the eyes of the Aborigines' Protection Society as to have been made the basis of representations to the British Foreign Office.

3. But two years more are allowed to pass in this extraordinarily leisurely business, and then, in 1905, the cocoa firms sent out an agent of their own, Mr. Burt, to visit the districts and report. Why were these precious years allowed to lapse without apparent action?
4. We are told that "Mr. Burt's inquiry extended over nearly two years." There was no need for any particular hurry, it seems, although the native workers were dying off all the time at the rate of 20 per cent per annum. It would be interesting to know to what extent, if any, the interval between 1903 and 1907 was employed in introducing some of the ameliorations on the larger estates referred to in Mr. Burt's report in order to make the case of the planters a little more presentable.

In short, what is needed is an independent inquiry in which the points just noted could be cleared up. At present we have only the evidence vouchsafed by the firms who are on their defence.

What will be the attitude of the Free Church Council in this matter? It is their especial concern, for Mr. Geo. Cadbury has been one of their most liberal supporters. Money made in connection with servile conditions in one part of Africa has been employed in fomenting an agitation against servile conditions in two other parts of Africa—the Transvaal and the Congo. What renders the situation more piquant is that the President of the Free Church Council at the time the revelations took place was, like Mr. Cadbury, a Birmingham resident, and member of the Society of Friends, whilst Dr. Clifford has taken the lead in denouncing the state of things in the Transvaal and on the Congo. The matter affords a touchstone of the Nonconformist conscience. Will it be said that as the eye sees other objects but does not see itself, so the Nonconformist conscience operates on the doings of others but never on its own.

If Dr. Clifford desires to denounce the iniquities of San Thomé and Principe, he might easily cull a few choice phrases from his own introduction to the anonymous work, "John Chinaman on the Rand." May I select for him a few appropriate touches? "It is another blood-stained page in the history of the inhumanity of man to man. It violates the domestic and the social ideals. It is inevitably and overwhelmingly immoral. It must go. It is not a necessity. It is a wanton iniquity. It is shuffling of the meanest kind to say that it is not slavery. Let Britishers realise their responsibility and bring to a speedy and final end this return to barbarism."

#### THE NONCONFORMIST CONSCIENCE SOMETIMES VOICEFUL, SOMETIMES DUMB.

Since the above lines were written, the Annual Meeting of the Free Church Council for 1908 has been held at Southport. Not a word of inquiry or protest or admonition was addressed to Mr. George Cadbury, who is one of their three Treasurers, in reference to his business associations with the servile conditions under which raw cocoa is produced in the island of San Thomé and the still more dreadful details of recruiting in Angola. So far was the Coun-

cil from shrinking at the thought of accepting Mr. Cadbury's money, that the Secretary gratefully referred at the Southport meeting to a further and quite recent gift of one thousand pounds made by him to the Council funds. Yet that the moral responsibility of Mr. Cadbury was felt by himself to be involved by his trade associations was obvious from his meeting the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce when they challenged the attitude of the cocoa firms in the matter, and also by the attempt of those firms to shelter themselves behind the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines' Protection Societies. In face of these facts the Free Church Council maintains an absolute silence. That body has only existed some sixteen years, and yet in that short space of time it has allowed itself without protest to be compromised on the one hand by Mr. Aked, who links them with Mr. Rockefeller and the methods of the Standard Oil Company, and on the other by Mr. George Cadbury, one of their Treasurers, who associates them with the horrors of Angola recruiting and the San Thomé cocoa plantations.

The Council found time to denounce the Congo atrocities, but not those with which certain of their own Free Churchmen had business associations. Since the advent of his political friends to power in January, 1906, Dr. Clifford seems to have lost interest in the conditions of labour in the Transvaal. Yet there is much that should demand the attention of one who wrote an introduction to "John Chinaman on the Rand." After more than two years of political power, his friends still tolerate the presence of nearly thirty thousand Chinamen, and negotiations are now going on for importing labourers to live in "compounds" from the French colony of Madagascar and the Portuguese colony of Mozambique. It is a significant and ominous combination that the British Minister at Lisbon, at one and the same interview with the Portuguese Minister of Marine and Colonies in March, 1908, pressed for a change in the methods of native recruiting in Angola, and also conferred on the recruitment of native labourers in Mozambique, and their employment in the Transvaal mines. If Dr. Clifford loses interest in the conditions of labour

on the Rand now that he can no longer make party capital out of them, one can only say that the Nonconformist conscience knows its friends.

There is a place in public life for denunciation, with its implied assumption of superior virtue, but the thing may easily be overdone. The note of sincerity is absolutely essential. Some Athenians wearied of hearing Aristides called the Just, although he never claimed the title, and yet fully deserved it. But when a man condemns in public what he does in private, what shall we say? This feat was accomplished a few years ago by a Nonconformist minister of Blackpool, who denounced from the pulpit the public amusements of that town of which he was subsequently proved by the directors to have been at the time a shareholder.

The Rev. B. Nightingale, in his "Story of the Lancashire Congregational Union," says (page 12) that "religious people had not then the slightest scruple about holding their religious gatherings in either coffee-house or tavern." He mentions the case of the Rev. Peter Walkden, for some years Nonconformist minister at Hesketh Lane, near Garstang, who "invariably went to a neighbouring public-house for a 'refresher' before entering the pulpit to preach. As late even as the days of Dr. Raffles, whose bottle of champagne was quite a feature of the annual gatherings of the Union, when the time for the sermon came the unfinished business was usually delegated to the committee, who would quietly slip away to the nearest and most convenient public-house for its despatch." The author adds: "All this shows us that we have travelled very far in relation to these matters." That is true enough, but one may very well wonder whether the change marks a genuine moral advance. Certainly the Congregational ministers of to-day would scarcely claim to be better men or truer Christians than Dr. Raffles. The influence of aggressive and intolerant teetotalism has of late worked up a sort of artificial and factitious conscience in the matter, until the mere holding of shares in a brewery by a Christian minister is declared to be a sin deserving expulsion from the Church, yet these same Churches admit

brewers to their membership. To strain at the gnat of a few shares in a brewery whilst swallowing the camel of a brewer and his entire brewery seems scarcely consistent. It is time the Nonconformist conscience wrought its verdicts into harmony with one another.

#### IS THE INFLUENCE OF THE FREE CHURCH COUNCIL NARROWING WESLEYAN METHODISM?

The Rev. J. S. Simon, President of the Wesleyan Conference, said at a recent meeting in Manchester that "the Methodists were not party politicians." Of course, the words do not imply that individual Methodists are not adherents of one or other of the political parties; he could only mean that the Methodist organisation was not employed by adherents of one political party to the annoyance and detriment of their co-religionists of the other parties; in other words, that no one political party was allowed to "capture," as the phrase goes, the machinery of Methodism for its sectional ends.

Is it true, then, that Methodism does not allow its religious organisation to be exploited by any political party? One's first impulse, in response to such a challenge, is to call up any incidents in our own personal experience bearing on the point. Before discussing the question on more general grounds, I will give a case or two which have been forced on my notice. I was in Manchester immediately prior to the general election of 1906, and was shown the "Monthly Visitor" of a Wesleyan Mission Hall in the neighbourhood. The "Visitor" was distributed gratis in large numbers, and this particular copy had been left at the house where I was staying. It contained a strong appeal to readers to vote against Mr. Balfour. Now, taking sides in a general election is, in my opinion, to that extent making Methodism political. It is employing the machinery of a Church which includes both Liberals and Conservatives in a way which pleases the former and displeases the latter. One can imagine the outcry which would be raised if Unionists attempted a like perversion.

During the recent controversy over the Mayoralty of

Alderman Holt there was delivered another copy of the same "Monthly Visitor," containing a letter to working men signed by the minister in charge. In this case the narrowest teetotal view was put forward in the name of Methodism. I quote a few sentences from the letter: "Public feeling has run very high, and has made it very clear, that there are in our midst a very large number of true-hearted citizens.

We maintain that the office of Lord Mayor of any city should be an office utterly disinterested with those things which go to constitute our grave social problems. There is no getting away from the fact that to this office should be brought all those stern qualities of heart and mind which continually seek out a city's good," etc. I will leave it to my readers to characterise the logic and English of these sentences.

About four years ago I was staying near Belper, and one day, strolling into the town, saw a notice that the Rev. E. L. J., of M., "the renowned Welsh orator," would preach at the Wesleyan Chapel in the afternoon, and lecture on "Oliver Cromwell" in the evening. I decided to hear the lecture. There was a very fair attendance. The superintendent minister gave out the hymn commencing "Soldiers of Christ, arise," and the junior minister led the congregation in prayer. The lecturer was then introduced. I soon found that the fare to be provided was intensely narrow and political. Of course there was an overstrained eulogy of Cromwell. In his anxiety to exalt his hero, the lecturer sometimes failed to grasp the implication of his own statements. Thus, in enlarging on Cromwell's greatness, he said that the greatness of a man must be gauged by the opposition he overcame. Now Cromwell, he told us, at the zenith of his power, never had more than one-sixth of the people of England on his side. This picture of Cromwell as a military tyrant, using the trained force of one-sixth of the nation to keep down the resentful, but helpless, five-sixths, accorded very ill with the picture which he had previously drawn of the Protector as the friend of freedom. The lecturer seemed to have three pet aversions—kings, bishops, and landlords. He mentioned as quite a won-

derful fact that he had found a book of which he was in search on a bookstall in a cathedral city. How could anything good come out of a place which contained the residence of a bishop?

Mr. J. even went into family matters. He told us that he had given his brother five pounds to buy basic slag to be spread on the old farm which had been occupied by their father before it came to be held by his brother. Being on a visit to his brother at the farm shortly afterwards, the latter took him to the field on which the basic slag had been spread, and drew his attention to the fact that, for the first time in the history of the field, it contained a crop of white clover. Mr. J. told us that he replied to his brother: "Adam sowed that clover in the Garden of Eden, but tyranny had kept it down till now." The audience found this wretched clap-trap immensely entertaining. They did not trouble their heads with reflections on the lecturer's assumptions. The location of the Garden of Eden in Wales—the way in which landlord tyranny could keep the seed from springing, and how the basic slag overcame the sterilising effect of landlord tyranny were matters about which they did not stop to reason. There was a dig at the landlord class, and that was enough. Yet all, or nearly all, those present accepted the traditional view of the early chapters of Genesis, according to which the first landlord was God Himself, with the first man as a tenant under one express condition of tenancy. This violated, an ejectment took place, which was enforced by angels as executive officers. But it is wasting time to treat seriously such stuff as Mr. J. gave his hearers. Suffice it to say that he went merrily on, delivering a lecture which would have been in place at a Liberal Club, but which was very much out of place in a Wesleyan chapel, and after a hymn and prayer. That the lecturer himself was well aware of the political character of his deliverance was strikingly proved. Before the lecture was over one of the audience rose and walked out. Mr. J. told the people not to be disturbed. "My Liberal pills," he said, "are strong, and have been known to *move* people out of the pew into the street."

Here then, was clear proof from the speaker's own lips.

1. That he knew he was delivering a political address.
2. That he was well aware that the views expressed by him were distasteful to some of his hearers and co-religionists.
3. That he gloried in the abuse of his position despite this fact.

As if to supply corroborative evidence as to the intensely political character of the lecture, the local Radical paper (*The Belper News and Derbyshire Telephone*) exultingly described it as consisting of "undiluted Radicalism."

The sophistical way in which this partisan abuse of a neutral platform is sometimes excused was well illustrated in the late municipal contest in St. George's Ward, Manchester. The managers of the Bridgewater Hall Wesleyan Mission organised a meeting for the Liberal (lady) candidate. After a hymn and prayer, Mr. E. Farrow, who presided, said "it was not usual to have meetings of a political nature in a Wesleyan church. This was not Miss Ashton's meeting, however. They had organised it themselves, and they had invited Miss Ashton to address them." This miserable quibble does not serve to disguise the fact that Mr. Farrow and his friends could not possibly have declared more emphatically for Miss Ashton's candidature than they did. They threw into the scale in her favour not merely their personal adhesion, but also the influence of the mission as such, with all its religious and philanthropic associations. These things, which are the property of no political party, were appropriated to the service of a political party. For in all these regrettable perversions, it is always the same political section which profits. What chance would a Conservative Wesleyan candidate have of being aided in the way Mr. Farrow helped Miss Ashton? That lady is, I believe, a Unitarian, but political preferences are stronger than religious affinities at the Bridgewater Mission Hall. In my boyhood the Wesleyan hymn-book contained a line which ran, "The Unitarian fiend expel." Even to-day Unitarians are excluded from association with the Free Church Council. But with Mr. Farrow and his friends politics were paramount.

## INFLUENCE OF THE REV. H. P. HUGHES.

These departures of Methodists from the tradition of political neutrality are a thing of comparatively modern growth, and much of the partisan spirit which is abroad may be traced to the example and influence of the late Mr. Hughes. As editor of the *Methodist Times* he made an onslaught on two important departments of Methodist work, the Foreign Missionary department and that concerned with the day schools. The former is only just recovering to some extent from the effects of the suspicion and mistrust aroused in the minds of some Methodists by the attacks of Mr. Hughes, while the educational policy of the Connexion has been completely reversed. When, leaving the lines of destructive criticism, he attempted constructive work in the case of the proposed "separated chairmen," or "Methodist Bishops," his efforts proved a failure.

In the pursuit of his educational policy, he initiated and persistently carried on a press campaign against Dr. Rigg by name and the recognised policy of the Wesleyan Education Committee. A parallel case would be presented if, say, the *Methodist Recorder* of to-day were to attack the present policy of starting and maintaining Wesleyan mission halls in the large centres of population, combining in the attack the name of Dr. Pope as the individual most directly associated with the mission hall policy. To what homilies on loyalty to the institutions and polity of Methodism would the iconoclasts be treated in such a case as I have imagined.

In his Presidential address to the Free Church Council in 1896, speaking of the divisions which had prevailed among the Free Churches in the past, Mr. Hughes said: "We have tolerated, if we have not encouraged, a portentous development of that self-assertion, that *trishna*, which Buddha wisely recognised as a main source of human misery. We have neglected the great Catholic virtues of humility, reverence, and obedience." These words are susceptible of an application undreamt of by the speaker. Mr. Hughes's personal tone, his subversive

policy, his disregard of the feelings of others in the pursuit of his ends, were so many lamentable instances of that self-assertion which, in another sphere, he sincerely deplored. So much accustomed are Wesleyans to this feature in the character of Mr. Hughes that instances of it are sometimes given by admirers who seem quite unconscious of the revelation they are incidentally making. Thus the Rev. J. E. Rattenbury, writing in the *Methodist Times*, a few months ago, says: "Mr. Hugh Price Hughes, addressing the students at Didsbury College in my day there, strongly advised us, to our intense amazement, to read the *Methodist Recorder*, and then added, in parenthesis, 'you will understand the superiority of the *Methodist Times*.'" It is happily not usual for the editor of one religious newspaper to abuse a neutral platform in order to decry a rival paper; yet Mr. Rattenbury quotes the incident as if the action were normal. Did the *trishna* in Mr. Rattenbury blind him to the existence of that element in Mr. Hughes?

Mr. Hughes assumed to be the originator and leader of the forward movement in Methodism, but some of the best elements in that movement owed their inspiration to other heads and hearts. It would be possible to name a distinguished Wesleyan minister, happily still living, who worked zealously for progress before Mr. Hughes appeared on the scene. The difference between the two might be summarised thus: That whereas Mr. Hughes worried two great departments of Methodist activity, the other wounded no sincere souls by personal attacks, sowed no seeds of partisanship and bitterness in the Connexion, but loyally sustained existing departments, and created on his own initiative two new and fruitful forms of service—a ministry to destitute children and a ministry of service by godly women.

Mr. Hughes intervened in a partisan spirit in the School Board election at Manchester in 1888. The "unsectarian" party had arranged for preferential treatment of Roman Catholic children in the Day Industrial School then being built. This plan I had strenuously opposed by voice and pen whilst a member of the Board.

I was considerably surprised when Mr. Hughes, speaking in the Free Trade Hall, gave vigorous support to the party responsible for the policy of placing the entire cost of Roman Catholic teaching in the new school on the rates. In the following year I wrote a pamphlet of 72 pages, "The Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, M.A., and Wesleyan Methodist Educational Policy," in which I attacked Mr. Hughes on the education question, and argued out the whole subject from the Wesleyan standpoint. To that pamphlet no reply of any kind was forthcoming. I mention this fact lest some should think that it was an easy task and one requiring little courage to arraign the actions and views of one who can no longer speak for himself. To this the reply in my case is four-fold: 1. The deeds of public men are public property and a legitimate object of public criticism. 2. I challenged Mr. Hughes in the most direct manner when he had every opportunity of replying. 3. He has now an abundance of potential defenders. 4. The real object of my attack is the partisan spirit and method he introduced and did so much to encourage in Methodism.

The spirit of aggressive self-assertion and the tone of jealousy and bitterness towards the Church of England which are too prominent to-day in Methodism are largely the fruit of Mr. Hughes's action. In the Education controversy of twenty years ago all the devices with which we have in more recent days been made too familiar were employed. Instances of clerical intolerance in the day schools were hinted at, but not produced. An ex-president of the National Union of Teachers told me that at a public meeting which he attended, Mr. Hughes gave some "cases" of intolerance, but when challenged to name the places where they had occurred, so as to give the opportunity of verification, he declined to do so. A few genuine cases would have been a perfect godsend to the party of agitation, but the difficulty felt in producing one such instance out of the many thousands of schools throughout the length and breadth of the land, bore striking testimony to the broad and loyal spirit in which the clergy worked the schools.

On one occasion Mr. Hughes ventured on a definite statement. He said that a certain clergyman in the diocese of Peterborough had made an intolerant remark about the ministers of the Dissenting Churches, for which he had been rebuked by his diocesan. The Bishop of Peterborough, on being written to on the subject, answered that no such case had ever been brought under his notice. No reply was made to this letter.

Some thirty or forty years ago a Church clergyman named Gace published a catechism of his own composition, which he intended for use in Church day schools. Its tone was so intolerant that Nonconformists might justly take exception to its teachings. "Gace's Catechism," as it was called, never came into general use; it is even questionable if it was ever used in more than half a dozen schools. But after what little Church demand there had ever been had ceased, there set in a Nonconformist demand for purposes of agitation, the intolerant sentences of Mr. Gace's Catechism being quoted as specimens of the religious teaching usually given in Church schools. With this catechism Mr. Hughes made great play twenty years ago, and in the general election of 1906, in Mr. Hughes's own country of Wales, Gace's Catechism was exhumed for purposes of misrepresentation. Some of the most intolerant sentences were read out at the meetings, and perhaps in the first instance the remark was made that it was a Catechism written by a clergyman of the Church of England. (Candour would have dictated the statement that the Catechism was a dead letter, not being used in any Church schools, but let that pass.) The next step was to call it *a* Church Catechism, and lastly it was regarded by the mass of the hearers as *the* Church Catechism. This was one of the mendacities with which the Welsh elections were won.

Largely under the influence of Mr. Hughes and his followers, the policy of the Wesleyan Education Committee has been reversed. Wesleyan day schools are being closed and the influence which Methodism should exercise in the settlement of national education is being steadily weakened. One-eighth of their number was surrendered

last year. The resolution of Conference which declared that till a desirable settlement was reached the Wesleyan Day Schools and Training Colleges should be maintained is dropped out of sight. Mr. Percy Bunting has even taken on himself to prophesy that in the future Wesleyans would themselves entirely support their training colleges. Thus the policy initiated by Mr. Hughes on the education question is triumphant. He sought to link Methodism to the unsectarian party on the English School Boards, and at a later date strove to connect it with the Free Church Council, which he had done so much to fashion. It is such gentlemen as Messrs. Perks, Bunting, and Lidgett, prominent Wesleyan members of the Free Church Council, who practically dominate the Wesleyan Education Committee. They reproduce the anti-Anglican bias, the political animus, and partisan spirit displayed by Mr. Hughes.

The London County Council election of March, 1907, afforded an example of the length to which some London Methodists would go in their attempts to link Methodism and their own political party. When the *Methodist Times*, of which Mr. Lidgett is editor, seeks in a leading article to make out that Liberalism is Christianity applied to politics, no one can object to the statement being made, for the paper is speaking only for itself. Even when it prints a leader on the two sides in the impending London County Council election under the heading "Loot v. Love," one may question the accuracy and good taste of the alternative as thus put, but no further objection can justly be made. When, however, the *Methodist Times* strove to commit the London Methodist Council to the support of the "Progressive" party, its action met with opposition, even from so ardent a Liberal as Mr. Perks. He resisted the attempt that was being made to issue a particularly violent "manifesto" in the name of the London Methodist Council, and succeeded in modifying its terms. I quote a portion of his interesting letter to the *Methodist Times*:—

"Sitting in my pew at Bayswater Chapel and looking round, I asked myself what will be the result of placarding

*such a manifesto upon the doors of our chapel? I remembered how a similar election poster was torn down from several Methodist chapel doors in 1904. I knew that a majority of the active and successful workers, and office bearers, of our Denbigh-road Church were Moderates and not Progressives. Those of us who vote "Progressive" are in a very decided minority. Such is the case in many London chapels. Was I to tell my Moderate friend in the next pew that he would be voting for a man of inferior character and intelligence if he supported the Moderate and not the Progressive candidate for Kensington? To post such a placard upon the doors of our chapels struck me as an un-Christian and stupid thing to do. A young preacher at our Council meeting charged me with being a 'reactionary,' and launched upon me a sermonette about duty and expediency."*

Mr. Lidgett's retort to this dignified and reasoned rebuke was to tell Mr. Perks that "there was a flavour of Satan rebuking sin about Mr. Perks's solemn warning against introducing party politics into the Church." Some other ministers were quite as extreme in their partisanship as Mr. Lidgett. The Rev. G. A. Bennetts, for example, contrasted "the triumph of Christ," i.e., the success of his party at the polls, with "a victory of the devil," i.e., the success of the other side, and that on a point which acutely divided Methodists. He also wrote: "It will be nothing short of a disgrace to Methodism if the (Methodist) Council should refrain from putting forth its utmost efforts to prevent the triumph of obscurantism, of mammon, and of vice in the approaching election." And he summed up in the following words those opposed to his views (among whom, as he well knew, were many of his fellow Wesleyans): "Those who are interested in the property and power of priesthood, and those who are interested in the liquor traffic, in gambling houses, in book-making, in brothels, and in debasing entertainments."

All this shows that there is a party in Methodism which does not scruple to use the common organisation for partisan ends. Hitherto it has been official Liberalism which

has gained by this intrusion of politics into religion, but of late a new development has occurred, and we have the Rev. J. E. Rattenbury using the pulpit of an important London Mission as a platform for Socialist propaganda. He advocates the breaking down of the present social system. He writes:—

*“Are you doing nothing to save souls if you can break down a social system which makes such things possible? If you establish a social order in which men may expect the minimum of decent existence as their human right—surely this is saving souls?”*

Mr. Rattenbury also advocates the nationalisation of children. “Children under Socialism,” he writes, “would undoubtedly be considered State property.” Monarchy, too, is doomed, but execution in this case is to be delayed, and so on. This is the Socialism that flows from Mr. Rattenbury’s pen, and which inspires the words that issue from his lips. Now, those who object on principle to the narrowing of Methodism will not stay to inquire whether these principles are good or bad. They will simply say that, good or bad, they are outside the scope of the Methodist pulpit. Even those who take the lower ground that the extraneous political teaching thus introduced may be encouraged, or, at least, tolerated, so long as it is in general harmony with the views of Methodists, should object to Mr. Rattenbury’s escapade, for Wesleyans are by no means prepared either to regard the State as possessing a prior right over their children or to pronounce with a light heart for the break-up of our present social order, or to contemplate with equanimity the prospective destruction of our ancient monarchy. Most Methodists hold that children belong primarily to their parents, although they recognise that the State has certain rights in and over them. When the Socialist tells them that they have one thirty-millionth share in their own children, but that, by way of compensation, they have the same fractional part of other people’s children, most Methodists would shake their heads. They do not think that the road to social evolution lies through the impairment of family life.

The action and attitude of Mr. Rattenbury will compel Methodists to face the whole question of the political neutrality or otherwise of their body. It is beyond question that if the opposite school of political thought attempted to employ the Wesleyan pulpit for partisan purposes, Mr. Rattenbury and his friends would be among the first to object to what they would deem an outrage. They would then perhaps see the essentially anarchic and disruptive nature of all such perversion. Let us hope that after due consideration of the matter the action of the political leaven may be stayed, so that there may be at least one religious body outside the Church of England where men of all politics are equally welcome, and feel equally at home. Mr. Hughes himself, in 1896, declared from the chair of the Free Church Council that "every true Church ought to be comprehensive enough to provide a home for men of every shade of political opinion." I notice with pleasure that Sir Henry Fowler, speaking in February, 1908, expressed a fear that Methodism had of late become a little too political.

In his eloquent special pleading on behalf of Socialistic propaganda in a Wesleyan pulpit, Mr. Rattenbury seems to magnify unduly the influence of circumstance. The *Methodist Recorder* of Feb. 27th, 1908, in an article on the Victoria Hall, Ancoats, has some lines which are worth quoting on this point: "If it is true that 'Sin will make a wilderness of any garden!' it is equally certain that 'Salvation will create a garden from a slum.' Go through some of these (Ancoats) streets, and you will come to a house distinguished from the rest by its neatly-sanded doorstep, its white curtains, and possibly a geranium in its clean window. It is nearly certain to be the home of a Mission convert. *The new heart has made the new home.*"

Sir J. S. Randles, M.P., writing in the *Methodist Recorder* recently, put the case for political neutrality in a forcible manner. He says: "I object to the pulpits and platforms of Methodism being used to promote any political objects. It is a taunt not without justification by Mr Rattenbury that 'party politicians have not the

slightest objection to ministers being politicians, so long as they share their own politics.' Our Sunday afternoon meetings have been largely used for the benefit of measures supposed to be favoured by the Liberal party. Now, these same platforms are utilised for Socialist advocacy by men who agree with Mr. Rattenbury, and hold his views with a religious enthusiasm. My idea would be for the Church to influence the world by sending into it men of Christian character, and to trust to their influence to deal with affairs, so that, in the work and business of life, as well as of the State, the Christian character of the citizens will produce Christian conduct, without seeking direct power and control over public affairs."

In the same issue "Scrutator" writes from Bangor: "The only answer to Mr. Rattenbury's special pleading, and to other Socialist ministers, is, 'At your own cost.' I am as much opposed as was Dr. Dale to the 'new union of Church and State,' as proposed by these people and militant Nonconformists generally; as to the existing State Church, if anything, rather more so. As I would say to the Ritualist, 'As many albs and stoles and genuflections as you like, if you pay for them yourself.' So to our Socialist and political ministers I would repeat, 'Get a church of your own, and if you can find supporters, proclaim your doctrines there; if you don't, then I and other laymen must either button up our pockets or clear out ourselves.'"

The point is perhaps put a little bluntly, but the danger indicated is a real one.

#### WHY SOME WESLEYANS DO NOT SUPPORT THE FREE CHURCH COUNCIL.

Unfortunately, as has been shown, Mr. Hughes himself did much to accentuate the partisan side of Methodism. The influence of the Free Church Council, of which he was one of the founders, has tended in the same direction. That all Wesleyans are not in sympathy with the aims and methods of that body was evidenced by the questioning appeal of the Rev. S. Chadwick, asking Methodists why they "held aloof." It was shown even more decidedly

in the replies which that appeal evoked. I will close this section with a few quotations from these able letters (*Methodist Recorder*, March 14th, 1907):—

The Rev R. Wentworth Little gave some details of the practical working of the local councils. I quote a portion of his letter: "In Derbyshire, a Free Church Council arranged with a Liberal Association to hold a joint meeting and to pay half of the expenses. Afterwards the local Churches, in some of which were not a few Conservatives, were requested to find their quota of the Council's debt. Not far from London a Free Church Council Social was called, stating that there would be refreshments and a collection, and adding that the Churches would be expected to make up any deficiency. In a Midland town a Free Church Council Girls' Guild was started, a house rented, furniture bought, and the local Churches were afterwards requested to find the money. Another Free Church Council incurred a debt, and asked the local Churches to pay their quota. My quarterly meeting repudiated any liability. I paid the amount, but could get only one-half of the sum from the friends. Some, perhaps, of the 'shy' superintendents have been twice bitten."

"Super" shows up the political action of the local Councils: "Mr. Chadwick does not admit that the Free Church Councils are political. Others think differently, and what occurred in my own circuit at the recent Parliamentary and L.C.C. Elections supplies evidence that they are not mistaken. The local Free Church Council issued handbills and posters, and sent a supply to each church in the circuit within its area, requesting that the handbills should be distributed in the pews, and the posters placed at the chapel doors. Their purport was to secure the election of certain candidates of one political colour. The ministers for the day were asked to read and comment upon the handbills, advise the congregation to vote for the candidates named, solicit volunteers as canvassers, and others to use their personal influence to secure the return of the candidates indicated."

Another Wesleyan condemns the Free Church Council

in more general terms: "It is because of this hypocritical pretence of being non-political; because of this self-righteous, pharisaical attitude towards political opponents; this spirit which is ready to claim the highest credit for the lowest ideals, and does not hesitate at the blasphemous and sacrilegious use of sacred names and phrases to support base and unworthy political schemes; this mean and crawling spirit which cries against the 'injustice,' the moral 'unrighteousness' of every opinion contrary to its own; it is because of these things that plain dealing men, such as I take it compose the body of our Methodist Church, 'look shyly at' Free Church Councils and their ways."

Mr. F. S. Green draws attention to the Council's anti-Anglican bias: "Intentionally or unwittingly, the Council in many places fosters a spirit of antagonism to the Church of England. Now, it is hardly to be expected that Wesleyan Methodism—taking, as it does, a *via media* between Episcopacy and Dissent—should join hands with those who are openly hostile to the Established Church."

"Guy Gayle" writes in a similar vein, but with larger scope: "Recent events have endangered the unity of the nation. The religious gulf which yawns between the Anglican half of England and the Free Church half is a matter of grief and dismay to silent thousands. Are there to be two Englands, as there are two Irelands? Is the Christianity of our nation to be divided for centuries into two opposing camps? It looks like it. What a spectacle! The Wesleyan Methodist Church never had a finer opportunity of manifesting a 'sublime aloofness.' She is not, in a political sense, a fighting Church, for she has never been in conflict with the State. Her mission in the world is unaffected by forms of government, and we imagine that even under a tyranny she would manage to deliver her message. She has drawn a glittering sword against the world, the flesh, and the devil. But she will never flourish that sword in the face of a sister Church, or use it to re-make a political constitution."

Such protests as these are weighty. May they weigh!

## MR. McKENNA'S BILL.

In the Nonconformist attack on the Education Act of 1902, the charge was made against that measure that it derived its inspiration from "the Bishops" and Convocation, and was marked by hostility to the Board schools. As has been shown, it was absurd on the face of it to argue that an Act for which the principal sponsors were Mr. Balfour (a Presbyterian), Mr. Chamberlain (a Unitarian), and the Duke of Devonshire (one of the broadest of Churchmen), was the bantling of the Episcopal Bench. All the same, I could never quite understand on what grounds the ecclesiastical leaders of the English Church should not be allowed some voice in reference to the education of English children, unless, indeed, it be a high Nonconformist principle that those who have done most for popular education are precisely those who should be allowed the least say on that subject. Certainly after having warned off the Bishops from the educational field, Nonconformists are asserting their own will in a tone the emphasis of which is in inverse proportion to their record of voluntary educational service. The Nonconformist members of Parliament consider it quite reasonable that they should sketch out a plan on which Mr. McKenna may frame his Education Bill. It was quite proper on the part of Mr. McKenna, and a proof of high impartiality, for him to declare that he should come to denominationalists, not with an olive branch, but "with a sword." When he professed his "hatred" of the denominational system that profession did not show his inability to do it justice in his forthcoming legislation, but proved to Nonconformist minds how admirably he was fitted to sit as a judge on a system against which he had declared himself violently prejudiced. Mr. Balfour must not associate with such questionable company as the bishops of the Established Church, but Mr. McKenna was quite justified in making a partisan speech to a Pleasant Sunday Afternoon gathering in a London Nonconformist Chapel. The Episcopal Bench must have little or no say on so extraneous a sub-

ject as national education, but the clerics of the Free Church Council may rightly assume to have a commanding influence in shaping the features and deciding the fortunes of the latest Education Bill.

#### A BLOW AT THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Mr. Birrell, speaking to his constituents after the rejection of his bill in 1906, said that he thought he had claims on the sympathy of Roman Catholics and Jews, for it was to please them that he had introduced his famous—or, if they liked, his infamous—Clause four. This striking admission shows that a Nonconformist Minister of the Crown, the son of a Baptist preacher, may without naming those two religious bodies, deliberately devise his bill in such a way as to offer them specially favourable terms, thus virtually discriminating against the Church of England. On similar lines run the provisions of Mr. McKenna's bill in reference to single-school areas. Here the effect, and presumably the intention, is to strike a great blow at the Church of England village schools without seriously affecting the schools of other bodies. The only difference is that Mr. Birrell conferred a favour on Roman Catholics and Jews of which Churchmen could not largely avail themselves, while Mr. McKenna strikes a blow which falls almost entirely on Anglican shoulders. To practically shut out the Church of England from advantageous terms to which others have access, as Mr. Birrell proposed, and to inflict damage on that Church, from which others are exempt, as Mr. McKenna proposes, are both equally acts of persecution. And this unequal treatment is offered by the party of religious equality.

Although the bill has been vigorously condemned by individual Roman Catholics, yet the Irish members in the House of Commons maintain a discreet silence, and the attitude of Archbishop Bourne is comparatively calm, not to say expectant. There can be little doubt that bargainings and concessions in that quarter are still to come. It will be difficult for Mr. McKenna to devise a plan for urban schools which will injure Church of England

schools whilst sparing other schools in a similar manner to his way with the country schools. Perhaps in the end special treatment of the Roman Catholics will be expressly proposed, a course for which the Prime Minister and Mr. Morley have in the past declared.

Lord Stanley of Alderley, speaking at Manchester a few days after the introduction of Mr. McKenna's bill, indicated his willingness to consent to special terms for the Roman Catholics, a policy which he recommended as a minority member of the Royal Commission of Education about twenty years ago. His words were: "The Roman Catholics were a separate community, and if they would let us have our public schools he should not object to their maintaining schools with a definite Catholic atmosphere. But if they chose to pull in with the Established Church—well, when the Established Church came down, somebody else would have to come with it."

Lord Stanley, with a touch of that cynicism which is not always absent from his public utterances, frankly treated Mr. McKenna's money proposals as an inducement to unfaithfulness to religious preferences. He said: "This bill would on the average throughout the country give a relief to the ratepayers equivalent to twopence in the pound. When people understood that he did not think they would be very much pleased with those who said that for the sake of the Apostles' Creed and the Catechism they must refuse this boon."

In another part of his speech he spoke of "going to the electors on the question of whether they would like their rates to be relieved at the expense of a little Catechism."

The *British Weekly* sees nothing wrong in the offer of this bribe, which it calls "a shot between wind and water which will tell." To me it seems another act of Nonconformist persecution. As one paper well puts it, to attempt "to get rid of a system which the Government considers objectionable (but which has been conscientiously adopted by a considerable section of the people) by bribing with money which is at any rate partly their own, those who will abandon it, and by mulcting of money also partly their own, those who refuse to do so, is a course which is

neither fair nor likely to commend itself to the good sense of the people." If a man accepts a bribe so offered he feels mean; if he refuses it he feels wronged. Moral degradation or financial injustice are the choice offered by the bill. Persecution is involved in the offer of such alternatives.

A teacher who spoke at the same Liberal meeting as Lord Stanley of Alderley revealed his anti-Anglican bias in a remarkably crude way. He actually implied that the views of Church teachers must not count, but only those of Council school teachers. I quote from the report of the *Manchester Guardian*: "Mr. J. Farish, speaking as a teacher, said he regretted that the National Union of Teachers did not give much support to the bill. He asked his hearers not to pay too much attention to the opinion of the Union, because it was composed largely of Church of England teachers, and quite recently large numbers of Roman Catholic teachers had joined it." Obviously if Mr. Farish could have his way with the National Union of Teachers it would in honesty be bound to change its name to the Nonconformist Union of Teachers.

#### IS THE BILL OF WELSH EXTRACTION?

We know that the contracting-out clauses of the bill were suggested to Mr. McKenna by the Nonconformist members of the House of Commons, but the drastic regulations in reference to single-school areas seem to me to suggest a Welsh origin. Of course Mr. McKenna is himself a Welsh member, but another and more influential Welsh member, Mr. Lloyd George, may possibly be the father of the measure. Certainly the bill if carried would at once strike a great blow at Anglican rural schools in Wales, gratify his friends and colleagues of the Free Church Council, and also cover up the traces of the "Welsh Revolt" which has proved quite as embarrassing to its friends as to its foes.

Contrast the generous and liberal spirit in which School Boards, with a denominational majority, developed between 1870 and 1902 the Board school system, which was not their particular choice of schools, with the petty

persecuting spirit which Welsh Nonconformists displayed towards the denominational schools which the Act of 1902 placed partly under their influence. Speaking in March, 1903, Mr. Lloyd George said that he "wanted the Councils to take the denominational school time-tables into their own hands. Don't let the managers draft it, but let the Councils so draft it as to permit a short interval to elapse before the school proceeded to the religious instruction. Let all the children go out for a few minutes. Then let those who preferred Catechism to play return for the religious instruction, while their play-fellows would be free to continue their own play. He had no doubt that the children would have such regard for Apostolic succession as would draw them back to the school while the wicked went away bird-nesting."

The Vice-Chairman of the Glamorgan County Council, at the Llandrindod Conference, said: "Religious education might be given in the last half-hour of morning school." (Laughter.) "There would be a general reaching for hats and coats at half-past eleven," said Mr. Hughes, amid laughter. (*Manchester Guardian*, April 6th, 1904.) Mr. McKenna in placing denominational teaching in single-school areas outside school hours has, by making it a sort of punishment lesson, even gone beyond the spirit of these flippant Welsh utterances. Such remarks as I have quoted show that it is possible to profess the principles of religious equality whilst aiming to employ the machinery of administration for partisan purposes. Even the cry of "No tests for teachers" is, in Wales, largely unreal, for, as the Bishop of St. Asaph stated without contradiction, the caucus makes secret inquiries as to candidates, and furnishes instructions to their party on the appointing committee.

The Rev. J. P. Lewis, in his able pamphlet on "The Hoodwinking of Wales," gives (page 41) a few statistics on the point. He mentions that under Welsh School Boards there were 2,133 Nonconformist teachers to 785 Church, and that in the Bangor diocese, out of 202 head teachers, only 32 were Church teachers and 170 Nonconformist. About sixteen years ago the late Rev. H. P.

Hughes publicly accused the authorities of a certain Welsh University College of harsh conduct towards a lady relative of his, assigning as the cause, in his opinion, of their unfair treatment that she was a Churchwoman. I do not go into the merits of the question. The significant feature in the case is the fact that he, a Welshman and Nonconformist, should sincerely believe influential Welsh Nonconformists capable of persecuting a Churchwoman for her religious opinions. It is possible to have professions of religious toleration on the lips and the principles of religious intolerance in the heart.

I do not here propose to discuss the Education Bill in detail. The masterly review of the Bishop of Manchester seems to me as unanswerable as was his letter against the anti-brewer agitation. In that case, as in this, he has been assailed with misrepresentations and abuse. In the local fight it turned out that the people of Manchester were on his side. I believe that in this national fight the people of England are on his side.

Nonconformist opinion is by no means unanimous in favour of the bill. The Rev. S. Cooper, a Wesleyan minister, writes to the *Methodist Recorder*, in reference to the injustice Mr. McKenna's bill would inflict on Churchmen: "To shut them out of their own schools, not to allow them to have their own religion taught to their own children by the public teachers, when they will be required to pay the Education rate, seems to me unfair." The other quotation is from a speech addressed to the Free Church Council at their recent meeting at Southport by Mr. Stead: "To my thinking we of the Free Churches occupy a position which is absolutely illogical, and, that being so, I do not have the same confidence that some have that the attempt to turn one kind of Christianity that we do not like out of school in order to put a Christianity we like into school in its place is likely to succeed."

Nothing more reveals the weakness of the Nonconformist case in reference to Mr. McKenna's treatment of the single-school area question than the deplorable logic employed by the *Christian World* (March 5th), in its

attack on the position of the Bishop of Manchester. Dr. Knox is therein charged with inconsistency because in 1900 he supported Cowper-Temple teaching in the Birmingham Board Schools. If he had at the same time advocated the surrender of Church schools, so that this Cowper-Temple teaching might also be taught in them, there would be some point in the critic's contention. What is the best possible under Board school conditions is not necessarily the best possible under other conditions. The other point objected to is the Bishop's statement as to "the appropriation of Church schools in rural districts by the local authority *without rent or other payments.*" The writer maintains that this is not so, because the Church is to have the use of its own building, cleaned, warmed, and lighted, on Saturday and Sunday, and for a short time before or after regular school hours for instruction in the disestablished religion. We have heard of the man who took his neighbour's goose but magnanimously sent him the giblets. The act did not win much gratitude. The writer even stated that the Church will have its parish meetings "run at the public expense," whereas for five nights in the week the parochial work, with its varied evening meetings, will be turned into the street, and would require hired rooms elsewhere if procurable. Is this minus quantity also a boon? Finally, the writer states that the clergyman is not prepared to keep his ordination vow to feed Christ's lambs, but "wants the State to do it for him." Those of us who have not quite lived in a cupboard know pretty well what proportion the voluntary personal labours and sacrifices of the Anglican clergy in the cause of elementary education bear to those of the Nonconformist ministers. On the whole one may fairly retort on this writer the charge he makes against the Bishop of Manchester in the same article when he says, "Those of us who watch his polemical utterances know him to be none too scrupulous in his methods of argument and none too careful as to consistency."

Nonconformists should be the last to talk of consistency on the education question, for their attitude for the last fifty years has been one long wobble. Even now they are

hopelessly divided at heart. In March, 1907, the President of the Free Church Council declared that if the Government proposed a system of secular education it would be impossible to carry a vote against it in that assembly. Yet in March, 1908, the same Council "unanimously" supported the proposal to make Cowper-Temple teaching universal. Liberationists voted for the establishment and endowment of religion by the State, passive resisters imposed enforced contributions for religious teaching to which hundreds of thousands conscientiously object. That Mr. McKenna's bill involved the establishment of religion in the schools seems to have been felt by the Free Church Council, for they recorded their "firm belief in the principles of religious equality and the freedom of *all churches* from State patronage and control." The old phrase used to be the freedom of *religion*, which would scarcely stand in view of the proposed establishment and endowment of London County Council religion. But why not drop the farce involved in the phrase "religious equality"?

The *British Weekly* (March 12th) points out to its friends the contrast between the views of the older and modern Nonconformists on the education question: "English Nonconformity in the present day is largely influenced by two beliefs, from both of which we dissent. The first is that it is the business of the State to teach the Bible in the schools. The second is that it is just and fair to all denominations that this State teaching shall consist of what is called simple Bible teaching. These propositions were rejected by the older Nonconformists."

The truth is that their present attitude, as Dr. Massie has candidly owned, is a matter of tactics rather than principle. He tells us that he believes in the "secular thorough," but that if Nonconformists went to the electors on those lines, "Mr. Balfour would sweep the country." So he puts the card of secular education up his sleeve for the present, and out of his great conscientiousness plays the card of Cowper-Templeism. For is it not the mark of a man of conscience of the modern type first and foremost to win the game?

Let us suppose the game won, and Cowper-Templeism

universally established at the public expense, how would men like Dr. Massie defend it against the attacks of agnostic passive resisters? I am supposing no impossible or improbable case, for such attacks have already begun. I quote an extract from the *Rationalist Review* for March, 1908, as an illustration.

#### AN AGNOSTIC PASSIVE RESISTER.

The article is headed "In the Police Court." I give the principal portions verbatim, the italics, however, are mine. The writer begins with a reference to the contract between himself as a solitary Agnostic protester and the crowd of Nonconformist Passive Resisters with whom he was for the moment associated. "It all looked so like a Chapel meeting. I felt like Judas among the Apostles. The splendid serenity of my associates impressed my agnostic sense. They had a Miltonic port and a Cromwellian glance. At least one imagined that that was the form their self-consciousness assumed. There is no doubt that the ordinary Free Church Passive Resister does verily fancy himself as a swordsman of the Lord and of Gideon."

"The Chapelite illusion was fairly complete when three most respectable magistrates entered the Court and took their seats at the Bench. Then a voice, pitched in the Methodist tone, which is so indicative of combined devotion and self-confidence, addressed the Bench. I cannot help the remark, in passing, that I doubt if Lord Cecil or the Dean made the observations attributed to them, but the veracious Nonconformist must bear the responsibility of his quotations."

"A second Cromwellian speech having enlivened the policemen, the presiding magistrate was about to close the case when I begged for a hearing, as I had been no party to the arrangement just carried out (by which two speakers stated the case for the whole group of Nonconformist Passive Resisters). Permission being granted, I said that.

*I strenuously and conscientiously objected to Simple Bible Teaching in Council Schools that I had heard a Bible Lesson given in each of the*

*Leicester Council Schools, and was perfectly aware of what was taught, that in my opinion such lessons were practically Nonconformist in method, they were sectarian, they were Philistine, they were unscientific, and in some respects morally unsound, though I agreed that some of the moral elements in this instruction were commendable*

The writer of the article continues: "Not one of the Cromwellians ventured to speak to me, as, bearing our heroic honours thick upon us, we left the court. I had followed their eminent example of passive resistance, and not a word of praise would they deign to bestow on my humble effort. Apparently they were taken aback with amazement that any citizens other than themselves should object to pay for an unjust system of religious instruction. They had gone on for several years denouncing priestcraft in the State-aided schools and at the same time *supporting a plan of Bible teaching peculiarly harmonious with the Nonconformist taste*. Such a procedure violated their own oft-repeated principle that the State should not patronise any special form of religion. *The hypocritical attitude of the Dissenters on the Education question will form one of the stock examples of British stupidity in the pages of the future historians of our social life, just as to-day we point to the South Sea Bubble as an instance of popular credulity in the eighteenth century*. We shall soon see whether Mr. McKenna is prepared once again to delay our educational progress in order to feed the vanity of the Dissenters by the retention of their favoured method of Bible exposition."

Against such attacks as the one just quoted the Free Church Council would be defenceless. For while denominationalists can point to their denominational contribution as a set-off to their denominational teaching, the advocates of universal Bible teaching propose to make no special money contribution, but force all, believers and unbelievers alike, to support, equally with themselves, their favoured form of religious instruction. Denominationalists have never admitted the right of a dissentient fraction to veto the wishes of the majority, but Nonconformists have proclaimed the principle of veto in its most absolute form, and asserted it to the mischievous and anarchic extent of passive resistance.

In so doing they have forged a weapon which, after it has achieved the result of abolishing the religious teaching acceptable to Churchmen, can be used by Agnostics with fatal effect against the Cowper-Templeism favoured by Nonconformists. Mr. Blatchford says that Christianity is not true, and he has many thousands of convinced and enthusiastic followers. One can imagine the play which an able writer like the editor of the *Clarion* would make with Dr. Massie whilst he applied the sacred principle of conscientious veto to his own case, and asserted the right of access of his followers to the teaching profession undisturbed by any test of fitness for teaching Cowper-Templeism. On which horn of the dilemma would Dr. Massie choose to be impaled? Would he disregard the protests of Agnostic passive resisters and so give the lie to his innermost convictions on the subject by persisting in their persecution, or would he say, "I was always with you, and now that Anglican teaching is out of the way, I will help you to oust Simple Bible Teaching," thus betraying Churchmen who had trusted to the stability of that form of religious instruction. Not only is Cowper-Templeism uncertain in its content, it has in itself the seeds of its own dissolution.

Outsiders see in the regulations as to single-school areas an attempt to secure predominance for Nonconformists. Father Naish, preaching at the Church of the Holy Name, said that "there was far more in the dispute than any question of the children; there was a tussle for supremacy, a strong determination on the part of the members of the Free Churches to oust the parsons of the English Church from the pride of place and influence in English social life, especially in the country districts."

If the proposals of Mr. McKenna as to single-school areas are carried out without modification we shall surely have heard the last of the oft-repeated tale of the persecution of Nonconformists by Anglicans in past centuries, for Nonconformists will then enjoy the unenviable distinction of being the only twentieth-century persecutors. The Bishop of Manchester has pointed out that the bill does not state when the proposed "transfer" of rural schools

is to take place. Does not this new Act of Uniformity, with its virtual ejectments, point to St. Bartholomew's Day as the appropriate date? Or did the Minister of Education feel a presentiment that his bill would never become an Act? If so, one may make a harmless play upon his name and asking "Where will the provisions of Mr. McKenna's bill come into operation?" supply the answer "Kennaquhair."

### THE LICENSING BILL.

There is a strong family likeness between the Education Bill of Mr. McKenna and the Licensing Bill of Mr. Asquith. Both represent reactions against Mr. Balfour's legislation—the one meaning that the Education Act of 1902 is not to be allowed a fair trial, the other that Mr. Balfour's licensing measure is to share the same fate. In Mr. McKenna's bill there is a persecuting element arising from religious animus, in Mr. Asquith's there is a persecuting element springing from political animus. As the one, though nominally educational, has little of education in it, so the other, though professedly in the interests of temperance, seems little likely to advantage that cause. What a disinterested outsider like myself desires in a Licensing Bill is the maximum check to intemperance combined with the minimum of material injury to brewers and publicans. The new Licensing Bill seems admirably adapted to effect the maximum of harm to the licensing trade with the minimum of benefit to temperance. Teetotalers admit in so many words that any measure must, in order to pass, have the moral support of many men who are not teetotalers; yet they advocate a measure which seems more unfavourable to the licensing trade than to intemperance, and which scarcely commends itself to the public conscience by the character and tendency of its main proposals.

Before referring to some of the provisions of the Licensing Bill I should like to enter my protest against the offensive language employed by some professing Christians in relation to those engaged in the liquor traffic. The other day a Nonconformist minister called publicans

"a crowd of pig-faced men." Such language does more harm to Nonconformity than to publicans; worst of all, it discredits religion, and gives point to the Agnostic sneer at "Christian manners." In the following paragraph, which I extract from the *Daily News* of March 5th, we see teetotal abuse producing active protest. "Lecturing at Tiverton, Mr. Tennyson Smith characterised the liquor traffic as 'a mean, vile, despicable, diabolical, devilish, damnable trade.' He expressed amazement at people being prepared to 'bow down and scrape' to a local brewer for the gift of a clock tower. The lecturer was pelted with missiles, and it was subsequently announced that his mission was abandoned." The incident supplies an instructive example of the bitter spirit displayed by teetotalers, and shows how by affronting the public conscience they throw the sympathy of the people on the side they attack. Let us hope that the lesson administered to Mr. T. Smith by the people of Tiverton will not be lost upon him. He should take a thought and mend his manners, for abuse is no argument.

Mr. Asquith in his brilliant defence of the time-limit principle was careful not to mention what had been so clearly laid down by the Lord Chancellor and Lord Bramwell in the case of *Sharpe v. Wakefield*, namely, that the justices could not act arbitrarily, that it was not in their power to repeal the law which permitted the sale of drink without just and reasonable cause, and that the absolute discretion entrusted to them by the legislature was to be judicially and discreetly exercised, within the limits which an honest man competent for the discharge of his duty should set himself. These considerations invalidate Mr. Asquith's argument. Let us bring the matter to a local test. Here in Manchester Sir Thomas Shann ably presides over the Licensing Committee. If Mr. Asquith is right, the Manchester justices could shut up all the licensed houses in the city at a stroke, but everybody realises, and no one better than the justices themselves, that whatever the theory of the matter might be, they never had any such real power in practice. One consideration, which so far I have not seen mentioned in the discussion, shows

that teetotalers themselves recognise this fact, namely, that by their advocacy of local veto as a separate and additional measure, they admitted that the justices had not before Mr. Balfour's Act the sweeping powers of total local prohibition which Mr. Asquith's argument implies. Misconduct, indeed, was not the only cause for which the justices could refuse renewal, but it was necessary that they should have some good and sufficient reasons for their decision. Their discretion was to be judicial, not arbitrary.

Mr. Asquith's second leading argument also seems unsound. He maintained that there was no property right in the renewal of a licence because, under the Act of 1904, when licences were refused the compensation money came, not from the State, but from the trade. But he loses sight of the fact that the licences with which the Act of 1904 dealt were superfluous licences, and that measure was only intended to facilitate the extinction of such licences by enabling the justices in cases where all the houses were equally suitable, but too numerous, to compel those which were allowed to remain open to compensate those which were closed. This was a matter as it were within the trade itself, with which the public had only a secondary concern, the presumption being that the increased trade at the surviving houses repaid them for their quota towards the extinction of those suppressed. But it is quite another matter to argue from this, as Mr. Asquith does, that there is no property in licences which are not superfluous nor otherwise unsuitable.

Let us suppose that we have reached the end of the proposed fourteen years' limit, when all superfluous and otherwise unsuitable houses will have been closed. Under the law as it was before 1904 the justices would have no ground for refusing renewal. If the right of renewal is to be destroyed by the fresh legislation of 1908, a new situation is created which bears no resemblance to that contemplated by the Act of 1904, a case in which the licence cannot justly be extinguished without the payment of adequate compensation by the State.

The question of a time limit has nothing to do with

temperance reform. It is purely a matter of money. The licensing trade can be so regulated as to minimise any influence for mischief incidental to it without resort to a time limit. Mr. John Morley, in speaking of the opium trade, reflected on those who wished "to be virtuous at other people's expense." The phrase applies here. It is noteworthy that opposition to the Licensing Bill comes from not a few friends of temperance. The honorary treasurer of the Birmingham branch of the Church of England Temperance Society has resigned his position and severed his connection with the Society on account of the Licensing Bill. He says: "I am quite unable to concur in supporting what I feel to be a most unjust measure." A Liberal member of Parliament, Mr. L. J. Tillett, says: "In my opinion, the bill is far too drastic; indeed, so stringent are its terms that it will alienate the sympathy of unprejudiced persons who have the cause of real temperance at heart. In my opinion, clubs are much too lightly handled in the bill. There is nothing in it which will do the cause of temperance any real good." Mr. W.T. Stead told the Free Church Council at Southport that "he hoped they would provide something to take the place of the 30,000 public-houses that would be closed. The public-house was the centre of social life, where people could chat with their neighbours. If they did not provide a substitute the last state of this land would be worse than the first.

He felt he should shock them, but he would tell them that he was against the abolition of the barmaid. The removal of woman from any sphere of social activity demoralised that sphere.

They should not let people regard them as sour-visaged people who would deprive other people of all their enjoyment. It was so easy to be virtuous at other people's expense."

To fix a rigid proportion of licence-reduction for the country seems inexpedient. The Welsh correspondent of the *Christian World* states (March 5th), that under this provision the licensed houses in Haverfordwest would be reduced from 56 to 9; Carmarthen, from 83 to 14; Cardigan, from 40 to 5; Monmouth, from 54 to 7; Ponty-

pool, from 48 to 9; Usk, from 34 to 6; Brecon, from 46 to 8; and Cowbridge, from 21 to 2. These figures are startling. It is no doubt undesirable that public-houses should be too thick on the ground in a town, but it would involve moral evil if people were too thick on the ground inside the public-houses left surviving after such drastic and inelastic reductions. Such results as I have just indicated were not unforeseen by Mr. Asquith, for in introducing his bill he mentioned cases where nine out of every ten houses would be closed. It would scarcely conduce to temperance or the orderly conduct of each tenth house in such districts for the customers of the other nine to be packed in the one surviving, nor would it be edifying for a queue to be formed in the street of customers waiting their turn of admission like the files at theatre doors.

The same writer goes on to show that under the bill licences may be increased. He says: "As in England, a very unexpected result of the bill becoming law would, however, be the possible actual increase in the number of existing licences! In some of the new industrial areas, licensing magistrates have been averse to the multiplication of licensed premises, the consequence being that the existing number is actually below what would then be the recognised statutory number of licences. For instance, Mountain Ash might be increased from 37 to 41; New Tredegar might have its licences doubled, while at Bargoed the present number might be trebled!" If, as seems likely, the bill will tend to augment licences in these districts, and so rigorously curtail them in others, as to either lead to rapid "soaking" in the public-house or to the formation of clubs, the total effect will not be in the direction of temperance. Moreover, many impartial men deem it unjust at the end of a time-limit to subject the remaining licences to local option, so that any locality may say that all remaining houses in its district shall be wiped out of existence without compensation. It is impossible that the reasonable requirements of the public should be met without sufficient security being given to holders of licences. In the absence of such security how

can it be expected that capital will be risked in the building and furnishing, say, of great hotels? To annihilate such capital without compensation would be an act of national unrighteousness.

Canon Hicks, writing in the *Alliance News* for March 12th, exhorts his Alliance friends in the words of St. Paul: "Quit you like men, be strong" (I. Cor. xvi., 13). Might I suggest that he should have included in his quotation the following verse, which would have afforded a much-needed hint to teetotal combatants as to the spirit and method of Christian controversy. That verse reads: "Let all your things be done with charity." In so far as the supporters of the Licensing bill are actuated by the single desire to check the evils of drunkenness, they will succeed, as they deserve to succeed. In so far as they merely wish to strike a vengeful blow at the representatives of a hated trade, they will fail, as they deserve to fail.

The words quoted by Canon Hicks remind one of a still earlier occasion on which they were employed (I. Samuel, iv.). There was war between God's chosen people and the Philistines, and the priestly sons of Eli had the Ark of the Lord borne into the camp of the Israelites as a sure pledge of victory. But although they had the Ark of the Lord with them, they had not the Lord of the Ark. The Philistines heartened one another with the words "Quit yourselves like men, and fight," and won a great victory, the news of which brought death to the aged Eli and birth to the hapless Ichabod. The glory was departed.

Is the struggle of to-day over the Licensing Bill destined to furnish a historical parallel? Certainly its supporters claim to represent God's chosen people. Is not the Ark of the Lord in their midst, and are not their foes those uncircumcised Philistines the publicans? All this may be so, and yet if the eternal principles of righteousness are violated by their proposals, they may fail. The struggle will be severe, for if Canon Hicks and his friends say to one another, "Quit yourselves like men, be strong," the other side take as their motto, "Quit yourselves like men, and fight."

## SOME BAND OF HOPE METHODS.

## SWEETS AND BITTERS.

Much was heard in the Mayoralty controversy about an individual manager of a public-house who gave sweets to the children who came to his place to purchase drink for their parents. The practice was undoubtedly wrong, and not to be permitted. As a matter of fact, it was stopped as soon as the owner heard of it, and has not been resumed. It was an exceptional case.

Some of those who condemned, and justly condemned, the action just described, would probably be very much astonished if they were challenged to give an account to the public of the influence exerted by themselves on the children who come under their training in Bands of Hope and elsewhere. They would resent such a challenge as an unwarranted imputation, and declare that their influence on childhood was an unmixed good—an influence entirely free from anti-social tendencies. Personally I am by no means sure that all the methods employed in connection with Bands of Hope will bear scrutiny. Sir Lauder Brunton recently stated that the exaggerated teaching about alcohol given in Bands of Hope did harm by teaching children to despise their parents. To my mind still more mischief is done by teaching children to hate and despise the brewer and publican as if they had created the drink trade and were solely responsible for the drunkenness of the drunkard. Let me give an illustration. The Rev. S. Chadwick, editor of the *Joyful News*, says (August 15th, 1907): "It was Charles Garrett who first awakened my interest in the work of temperance. I was only a Band of Hope boy when I heard him say there were more public-houses in Liverpool than we could see stars in the heavens; and oh, how he pleaded for helpers against the soul-destroying and devilish traffic! I wept with the rest, and with my boyish fist clenched I vowed in the name of God, if ever I got a chance to strike I would hit hard. I thank God for a place in the fighting line, and as I have been able I have smitten without fear or faltering." Now the Rev. Charles Garrett was

personally one of the best and kindest of men, yet he is herein reported as telling a group of young children that there were more public-houses in Liverpool than they could see stars in the heavens. Was this statement true? It was not. Have Christian ministers a licence to say what is not true when speaking of the licensed trade? They have not. It cannot be right to fight the Lord's battle with the devil's weapons. The cause of truth should be built on truth and truth alone. Yet Mr. Garrett doubtless thought he was doing God service by stating what was not true, just as Mr. Chadwick reproduces the false statement without any apparent sense of its moral obliquity.

Consider, too, the effect on a susceptible boy such as Mr. Chadwick then was. He weeps, clenches his fist, and vows to "strike hard." Strike at what? His childish mind would pass by such abstractions as drunkenness or the drink traffic, and concentrate its hatred on that concrete object the publican. Common sense would suggest the thought that as the English people called the drink traffic into being, and kept it going, it was not just to make a scapegoat of one class for the sins of all classes. Instead of this, hatred of the publican is sown in the minds of young children. That the attitude of Charles Garrett is reproduced in Samuel Chadwick we see from the above extract. If further proof were needed, it might be found in another portion of the same issue, where the editor says "The drink traffic is of the devil. It is engineered from hell, and is the greatest enemy of God and man."

Another Wesleyan minister, the Rev. C. W. Andrews, in his letters to young men and women, contributed to the *Methodist Recorder*, argues quite calmly and dispassionately against raffles at bazaars in which religious people are interested, and in reference to betting mildly says that "the feverish, reckless gambling of the present day is a symptom of a deep and deadly disease, and we must not be content to get rid of the symptom, but must try to cure the disease." But when the same writer comes to speak on the licensing question we have such stuff as the following: "Every public-house at present is a pest. They reek with disease. Then the public-house

is a nest of immorality. I really believe that the spiritual hosts of wickedness, the rulers of the darkness of this world, are actually there. I feel it myself. It is a case where I have to say: 'Get thee behind me, Satan.' I sometimes feel as if, but for this, a few visits might turn me into a dare-devil beast. Ought we to go on tolerating a gigantic plague-spot like this? Oh, young Methodists, for the love of Christ, be politicians. Give your eye to the Government, and watch for the Licensing Bill."

After this shrewd touch of political partisanship Mr. Andrews goes on: "Have you read 'The Cry of the Children'? When I read it I broke off to pray. And very slowly and deliberately, alone in my study, I said, over and over again, 'O, God, in Thy mercy and Thy wrath, damn the drink traffic.'" Such language seems to me not merely anti-social in its implied teaching of class hatred, but also to breathe an anti-Christian spirit. If the utterances of these two prominent Wesleyan ministers in two Wesleyan papers are to be taken as a fair specimen of the bitter spirit infused into the minds of the young in connection with Bands of Hope and other temperance organisations, there is urgent need for a revisal of the methods employed in such work. If the distribution of sweets to children on a small scale by one individual publican was a thing to be stopped as an offence against society, much more is the wholesale infusion of bitterness into the minds of the young a thing to be stopped as a greater offence against society. If the aims of Band of Hope workers are Christian, their spirit and methods should be Christian too.

Paragraphs appear from time to time in the religious press lamenting that so many Band of Hope children fall away from the pledge in their teens, so that the effect of the work on adult teetotalism appears small. Why is this so? Partly, I think, because the statements made and the pictures drawn at Band of Hope gatherings are so overstrained and exaggerated that the shock of surprise which comes when the facts of real life are faced drives former members to the opposite extreme. Finding that the publican of flesh and blood is not the ogre he has been pictured,

they give him the sympathy which most Englishmen accord to men who, they feel, have been unfairly treated. This air of unreality and exaggeration in Band of Hope work goes far to account for the languid support it sometimes receives. At the recent annual meeting of the Lancashire and Cheshire Band of Hope Union attention was specially drawn to the fact that the Union's subscription list for Band of Hope work did not reach £500, or less than one-hundredth part of the sum spent in intoxicating drinks every day in the Union's area. If Band of Hope methods did not need overhauling, this striking disproportion would not exist.

“STORMING THE CHANCELLOR.”

“FREE CHURCHES AND LICENSING.”

Under the above headings the *Christian World*, in its issue of November 28th, 1907, gave an account of a deputation from the Free Church leaders to Mr. Asquith on the subject of Licensing Reform. The account is interesting and instructive because it shows that not even in interviewing a Cabinet Minister of the highest standing can Free Church leaders drop their personal and somewhat truculent tone. Their interview with Mr. Asquith was marked by features peculiar to the Free Churches—it was, as the *Christian World* puts it, a case of “Storming the Chancellor.” Let us note a few of the self-conscious and personal touches which seem to be an inevitable element in Nonconformist utterances. The *Christian World* says: “It was curious to hear Dr. Harris hinting to the only Chancellor ever reared in Nonconformity that the Free Churches were a body which he might have met before.” One would think so indeed. Mr. Asquith met this gratuitous flourish with the non-committal answer, “I have heard of them.” Mrs. Price Hughes was the only lady member of the deputation, the leader of which thought it necessary to assure the Chancellor that that lady “would not misbehave.” Dr. Hanson forgot for the moment that he was supposed to be present in a representative capacity, and employed the pronoun of the first person singular. He wanted to see a reduction of licences, and, he added, “I

am not prepared to wait." "We do not," he continued, "want any fiasco like the Education Bill. There was too much compromise in that." The report says that "Mr. Asquith lifted his eyebrows," and well he might, at this specimen of tact and courtesy. Dr. Hanson blundered on, "Excuse me exhorting you thus," whereupon the Chancellor grunted back the appropriate reply: "We are quite used to that." Dr. Hanson made a statement which I submit to the judgment of my readers: "The public-houses," he said, "were only kept open on Sundays for sots, as no respectable artisans would enter them." One might think that these escapades would have sufficed for a single member of the deputation, but Dr. Hanson continued to be more amusing still. I give the *Christian World* report: "A delightful little passage of arms followed his interruption of a speaker—Dr. Hanson—who said he had heard rumours that the Government did not intend to deal firmly with the licensing question. Mr. Asquith: You must not believe all you read. Dr. Hanson: I did not read it. I heard it. Mr. Asquith: That is worse still. (Laughter.) Dr. Hanson: It was told me in strict confidence. Mr. Asquith: That is the worst of all. (Laughter.)" Who but a member of a Free Church Council deputation would tell the Chancellor of the Exchequer he had "heard a rumour" that they intended to misbehave themselves, who but Dr. Hanson would proclaim to all England what had been told him "in strict confidence"? Wishing to be impressive, Dr. Hanson made himself ridiculous.

The Rev. Silvester Horne was introduced to the Chancellor as the "Prince Rupert of Nonconformity," a clash of associations which shocked Mr. Asquith's feeling for congruity of ideas. This gentleman, unlike Dr. Hanson, spoke to Mr. Asquith "in persuasive tones and with marked deference." One of his proposals—the abolition of barmaids—has happily little chance of acceptance. The path of genuine temperance reform does not lie along the lines of class persecution. Our object should be, not to dehumanise the public-house, but to elevate it.

The leader of the deputation, Dr. Rendel Harris, said that "no more gifts should be made to those horse-leeches'

daughters—the liquor traffickers.” The reference obviously is to Proverbs xxx. 15, which reads: “The horse-leech hath two daughters, crying, Give, give.” It is difficult to imagine a more inappropriate reference. We all know how persistently Mr. Balfour’s Licensing Act was misrepresented as a “Dole to the brewers and publicans,” Mr. Arthur Chamberlain even going to the absurd length of stating that it conferred an added value of three hundred millions to the total licences of the country. This prophecy has been cast on the huge rubbish heap of exploded teetotal mis-statements, but it is equally foolish and unfair to represent a trade which is already heavily taxed, and only asks to be let alone, as if it were the one to raise the cry of “Give, give,” as against the State. The suggestion of Mr. Horne, a member of the deputation, that “something like a system of high licence might benefit the Treasury,” shows in what quarter the cry of “give” originates. The one remarkable feature of the deputation was the belief entertained by its members as to the moderation of their proposals. Dr. Harris said: “We are social reformers, pleading our own moderation.” Mr. Lidgett asked for the reversal of the 1904 Act by the imposition of a time-limit, further limitation of hours on Sundays, total closing on election days, further protection of children, and the licensing of clubs. After this fairly stiff list he stated rather inconsistently that he did not ask for “heroic measures.” His proposed measures of reform, although not “heroic,” were, however, to be heroic enough to “remove the licensing question from the subjects for legislative consideration for many years.”

An impartial spectator, had he been present to speak in the name of justice, might possibly have told the Chancellor and his clerical deputation that they themselves represented the two daughters of the horse-leech rather than the interest suggested by the leader of the deputation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, with his array of taxes, cries “Give, give,” to the tune of about 150 millions a year, while ministers of religion, with their manifold appeals for funds, cry “Give, give” to the extent of several millions annually. One has even heard of a cry of “Give, give,”

being raised in relation to an effort to collect the sum of a million guineas in one denomination alone over and above the ordinary contributions of its members. Of course there is nothing objectionable as such in the appeal of the Chancellor for taxes or the appeal of ministers of religion for financial support. Morals and the public weal are only concerned to ensure that the demand shall be reasonable and equitable in each case. The interests of the nation as a whole demand from the Chancellor that no class should be made the mark of spoliatory or vindictive legislation, just as the same interests demand that the financial pressure exerted by ministers of religion should not be so excessive as to interfere with the satisfaction of the ordinary social claims. Let me illustrate the latter point. A few months ago a will was proved under the terms of which the widow was bequeathed about one-twentieth of her late husband's estate, the great bulk of it going to swell the funds of religious and philanthropic societies. Of these, seven were named (of which a well-known Manchester institution was one), among which a large capital sum was to be equally divided. The share of any one of the seven, if invested in a life annuity for the widow, would have produced an income larger than that vouchsafed to her by her late husband. This disproportionate giving has caused unfavourable comments. We talk of a suttee in India, but there is a suttee of a widow's resources as well as of a widow's life. Money that is obtained by the invasion of a widow's means, that is watered by a widow's tears, and followed by a widow's just resentment, can scarcely prove a blessing to any good cause. The whole transaction bears too strong a resemblance to that "devouring of widows' houses" which Christ expressly condemned.

Just as the cry of "Give, give," raised by ministers of religion elicited in the above case an excessive response which is not endorsed by the public conscience, so it may be possible for the Chancellor and his supporters in Parliament to propose and carry through confiscatory legislation which will be condemned by the mass of reasonable men. Such legislation, being based on injustice, could not prove a lasting settlement. The proposals of both Chan-

cellor and deputation must stand to be judged by a higher law than the law of the land, I mean the eternal principles of justice and right.

#### OPEN LETTER TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF MANCHESTER.

You, my Lord, as one of the foremost educationists of the day, in coming to Manchester could scarcely fail to note the efficiency of the educational organisation of our city. Great authorities have borne witness to this undoubted fact—among others, Lord Stanley of Alderley, Dean Welldon, and Dr. Macnamara. The last says:—“In its efforts on behalf of education Manchester is second to no city in the empire. No city in the United Kingdom, not even north of the Cheviots, can show a grander record, and no city possesses a system in which the various grades of schools are so thoroughly and scientifically linked together.” In securing this eminently satisfactory state of things the School Board of Manchester has in its sphere played no small part, and, to my mind, the present advantageous position of elementary education in this city appears as an inspiring example of the zeal and devotion, the loyalty and broad-mindedness which Manchester Churchmen brought to the work of the School Board. I will mention three typical laymen whose names are honoured as labourers in this field—Oliver Heywood, Herbert Birley, and George Milner. Among the clergy who took a prominent part in School Board work were the late Dean Maclure, and one who justly ranks as one of the greatest educational experts in the country—I mean the Rev. Canon Nunn. To him, more than to any other man, is due the scheme of religious education which obtains in the Council schools, and under his chairmanship were taken the first steps in that reorganisation of evening instruction which has won for the city so much distinction in educational circles. It is far from my wish to strike a sectional note, but at a time when such scant justice is done to the actions and motives of denominationalists, it is well to point out that all the results obtained under the Manchester School Board were gained with a strong

denominational majority in power. From 1870 to 1902 between one and two millions of money were drawn from the Manchester rates for the promotion of the class of school preferred by undenominationalists. When, under the Act of 1902, denominationalists were admitted to some share of the rates towards which they so largely contributed, and from the benefit of which they had so long been debarred, this step was represented not as the rectification of a grievance, but as the erection of a privilege, and passive resisters appeared on the scene.

Not merely in building up a system of schools which was not the school of their choice, did Manchester Churchmen display their breadth and liberality, but also in the bestowal of patronage. Complaint is sometimes made by Nonconformists that they are excluded from the more lucrative posts in educational work. In Manchester there are three positions the emoluments of which run into four figures; they are all held by Nonconformists. Manchester denominationalists may then recall without shame their past record, which stands in such striking contrast to that made or being made in some districts where the opposite party is in power.

So far have Churchmen been from abusing their position to the detriment of the other side, that some of their number have been ready at every crisis to yield even on important points of principle. Either carried away by political prepossessions or through sheer timidity, or misled by a spurious liberality, or yielding to what they deemed the drift of the times, they have advised surrender. It is your lordship's high function, at this period of crisis in national education, to lead those who are determined that the claims of definite religious instruction to be one of the vital elements in primary education, shall not be unheard. But for you, and such as you, there would be great danger of the real wishes of English parents, and the real needs of English children, being disregarded in the matter. A highly-organised, active, and voiceful minority may, as things now stand, prevail against an apathetic and passive majority. In the House of Commons at the present time there are some two hundred

Nonconformists, who are stout representatives of their own sectional view, while the majority of Churchmen sit on the same side of the House. This tends not to representation, but to misrepresentation.

Wherever one turns, one sees the true principle of representation largely falsified. Here it is the executive of the National Union of Teachers, with only five Voluntary school teachers out of a membership of fifty, and not one from Lancashire; there it is a handful of Socialists dominating a vastly larger body of trades unionists. At our very doors we have nine members of Parliament for Manchester and Salford, all on the side which was uniformly in a decided minority on the School Boards of the two towns from 1870 forwards. The fact is that in both what may be called electoral efficiency—the power to influence the selection and election of members of Parliament—and also in Parliamentary efficiency—the impact on Government and legislation of their members when elected, the friends of denominational schools are weaker than they should be. In your efforts to secure a juster correspondence between the wishes of English parents on matters of education and the decisions of Parliament, your lordship will offend powerful interests, encounter much opposition, and incur some opprobrium. But just as your letter on the Mayoralty question, despite the storm with which it was received by one section, proved to be in harmony with Manchester opinion, so in this larger question of national education the partisan attack upon your views may be followed by the endorsement of the masses.

In his letter to the *Manchester Guardian* (March 3rd, 1908), commenting on your criticism of Mr. McKenna's bill, Dr. Goodrich stated that Nonconformists were "trying to forget" the oppression of such acts as the Schism Act. To remind us yet once again of a thing is a somewhat odd way of trying to forget it, while to go back over 190 years for a case of oppression shows that the Nonconformist memory is as long as it is unforgiving. Instead of forgiving his Church brother seventy times seven separate offences committed against him as a Nonconformist of to-day, the latter reaps up on seventy times seven

separate occasions an offence committed by distant spiritual ancestors of the one to distant spiritual ancestors of the other. Such work as this savours more of a pagan blood feud than of the tender mercies of Christian charity.

That Manchester citizens may be able to judge between Churchmen and Nonconformists on the education question, it is not necessary for Dr. Goodrich to take us back to the reign of Queen Anne, or recite for the hundredth time the tale of wrongs which ought by this time to be as dead as that respected sovereign herself. We are at the beginning of the twentieth century, not of the eighteenth, and the point that concerns the citizens of to-day is as to which of the two parties is fairest in dealing and freest from the persecuting spirit. Their record is before the people in the history of the local School Board; let them see and judge. As a matter of fact, more than one School Board election was fought practically on this issue. In 1885 the Unsectarian party, aided by two Church members, so outraged the sense of justice of the remaining Church members by what the latter held to be a distinct breach of faith, that they walked out of the Board room in a body, and most of them resigned their seats. The election of November, 1885, showed that the persecuting action of the Unsectarians did not meet with public approval. So unpalatable to the defeated party was the result of that election that one extreme partisan, a passive resister of the seventies, declared that the Manchester School Board was "in the hands of its enemies"! What had really happened was that the partisan and persecuting policy of the late Board had received a much-needed check. The election of 1888 turned on the question of fidelity to principle. The party of religious equality had favoured the policy of preferential treatment for the Roman Catholics in the new Day Industrial School, by which Roman Catholic children, and those alone, were to be given their full denominational instruction entirely at the expense of the rates. One wonders whether the passive resistance conscience was hibernating at that period. However that may be, the public conscience declined to lend its sanction, for the membership of the Unsectarian party at the next

election sank from six to four members, out of fifteen. I venture to think that if Manchester had to vote to-morrow between your lordship's educational policy and that of Dr. Goodrich it would not be you who would need to fear the verdict.

The sympathy felt with you in the somewhat personal and persecuting tone adopted by certain of your critics is quickened in the case of some of us by a sense of community in suffering. If I might be pardoned a personal reference, I would mention how much I resented such charges as one made against me in a newspaper leader that I was obstructing the work of the School Board of which I was a member, or the attempt to destroy the influence of a pamphlet which I had written, by calling me the literary gladiator and faithful henchman of Mr. Nunn. Nothing wounds one who loves education more than to be called an obstructionist; few things are more objectionable to a man of independent mind than to be styled the henchman of another, and to be compared to a gladiator who fights for show and pay. Certainly those who hurl such unfounded charges at their opponents should not complain of persecution, for such intolerance of opposition is a sure mark of the persecuting spirit. One of the most flagrant instances of this narrow-mindedness occurred in Manchester about twenty years ago, when a leading Non-conformist, commenting on an election in which he had been defeated, wrote in cold blood some weeks afterwards that commentators differed as to the meaning of the beast in the Book of Revelation, but that in Ardwick the number of the beast was so-and-so, giving the number who had voted for his victorious opponent. One is glad to feel that such an utterance would be impossible to-day.

Although for some years past a dead set has been made at the bishops by Dr Clifford and other like-minded controversialists, yet popular feeling has not responded as in the old days, when, in the words of Butler: "The oyster-women locked their fish up, and went away to cry—No bishop."

Your lordship runs no risk of being committed to the Tower, like good Bishop Hall, or of incurring the

dangers of mob-law in the public streets. There are signs that even the acrimonious tone in which some Nonconformists indulge with regard to you is regretted by the nobler souls among them. At the recent meeting in the Memorial Hall in support of the Education Bill, after rather carping speeches by Drs. Goodrich and Adeney, there followed a speech by Professor Peake, conceived in a different spirit. I quote the *Manchester Guardian* report: "Professor Peake, while deploring that this education controversy should be so long continued, asked that it might go on with dignity and self-restraint on the Nonconformist side. He thought that controversialists, especially if they wore the Christian badge, should appear clothed and in their right mind instead of in war-paint, raising the war-whoop and thirsting for their enemies' blood, and greedily grasping their enemies' scalps. That is the kind of thing that privilege does for us. It makes us insolent. It is blind to the rights of others. It can hardly see that others have any grievance whatever." Whilst welcoming the spirit of these words, the friends of denominational schools are entitled to point out that any position of vantage they have hitherto held has been won by denominational service and sacrifice, at the invitation of the State, on terms open to all alike, whilst Mr. McKenna's Bill, by establishing and endowing undenominationalism entirely at the public expense, would place that form of religious teaching in a position of privilege and predominance.

The meeting at which Professor Peake spoke was held in the Memorial Hall, which bears on its face the inscription: "In commemoration of the year 1662." Nonconformists allege against the Act of 1662 that it established religious uniformity, affronted some consciences, and involved a certain amount of ejectionment. This was in the matter of churches. If I understand aright the position of your lordship, you contend that in the matter of schools Mr. McKenna's Bill also establishes religious uniformity, affronts some consciences, and involves a certain amount of ejectionment. Will Nonconformists set up a grievance in the twentieth century parallel to that of which they com-

plain in the seventeenth? What was partly excusable at a time when each side persecuted in its turn would be inexcusable now, when all parties profess to have learned the lesson of toleration.

### OPEN LETTER

TO THE REV. CANON E. L. HICKS, M.A.

In reflecting on the weeks of turmoil to which your agitation on the Mayoralty question condemned the citizens of Manchester, one feels that it was no slight matter for a man of peace to disturb the peace of the city—for a believer in representative government to flout the will of the city's duly elected representatives—for a professed friend of liberty to erect a new disability in connection with the Mayoral office, and for a man of kindly disposition to display such indifference to the feelings of Alderman Holt, his family, and friends. That you should do all this despite your high scholarship and lofty personal character is a matter which calls for, and will repay, some study. It affords an object lesson on the extent to which extreme opinions of a certain class bias the mind and pervert the judgment of one who is otherwise among the best of men.

You made it a charge against Alderman Holt that he persistently thrust his houses on districts that did not want them, but you had no hesitation in thrusting on Manchester an agitation which the city certainly did not want. Not a single new public-house can be opened without the previous consent of the Licensing Authority, but no court authorised you to thrust your agitation upon Manchester. From the first there were signs that your action ran counter to the wishes of the citizens. But although check succeeded check, not one nor all could arrest your obstinate persistence. In vain did the *Manchester Guardian* suggest that the man should be considered apart from the brewer. In vain, too, did Mr. Samuel Watts rebuke the bigotry from which the movement sprang. His Honour Judge Parry, anticipating by a few weeks the verdict of Manchester, dubbed your party "bad citizens," but without any deterrent effect. The

"charges" of Mr. Lewis were disproved, to the shame of the accuser, whereupon the *Guardian* proposed to "call a truce," but this suggestion you repudiated—"no truce was possible." The same paper closed its correspondence columns to your anonymous and other supporters, but you went on unabashed. Signs of internal weakness made themselves manifest—instead of every ward being contested on the question came the melancholy admission that no candidates were being brought forward by the Citizens' Committee, whilst appeals for contributions of money issued from a quarter where we had been led to believe that funds abounded. Your chief associates were ashamed to hoist their flag. Mr. Edwyn Holt, the protagonist in a former struggle, lacked the courage even to name the subject in his election address. Mr. A. Thomson professed not to make his election turn on the question on which the public had been told that every election was to be made to turn. But not all these multiplied checks availed to give you pause. You went on to the protest meeting in the Free Trade Hall, with its premonitions of ultimate failure in the scanty platform, the unfilled hall, and the speeches doubly bitter from the sense of impending defeat. Even the crash of the November elections left you unconvinced of the wrongheadedness of your action, for you advanced to the final act in this pushful comedy by thrusting on the City Council a "manifesto," which it certainly did not want. Blind leaders cannot be persuaded to stop till they have landed themselves and their followers in the ditch.

In one of your letters referring to Mr. Holt, you spoke with implied contempt of his acting "according to the moral code of his business." I know of no special type of morals peculiar to the business in question, but I do see in the moral code of your agitation a distinct type of no very exalted character. The groundless charges, the unworthy insinuations, the misrepresentation of facts to which Mr. Robert Lewis resorted, did not impress the citizens of Manchester with a very lofty idea of the moral code which governed his part in the agitation.

Turning from Mr. Lewis to the class he represented, one

may ask what kind of moral code is the possession of a party which declares at the beginning that one single point is so all important that every ward election must be fought upon it, and towards the end holds that not a single election should turn on that question? Was it loyalty to principle at all costs, or moral cowardice and mere expediency which led Mr. Edwyn Holt and Mr. A. Thomson to furl their flag and hide it away as if it were an item of stage property not required in that particular act?

But to my mind the most objectionable item in the whole course of the agitation was not the deed of any individual. In the "manifesto" of the Citizens' Committee there is a clause, "By joining in the manifesto none of us is committed to any opinion as to the legitimacy of the moderate use of intoxicating liquors," etc. This invitation to beer-drinkers to join the committee in banning a beer-brewer shocked the moral sense of the community. Such an appeal might be in perfect accord with the moral code of Manchester's best and wisest citizens, but it was unhesitatingly repudiated by the conscience of the man in the street. So sophisticated a plea could, it was felt, only issue from sophisticated consciences.

I have already referred to the action of Mr. Robert Lewis in this matter. One particular fact which caused the most unfavourable comment on him and those who lent him their moral support was his claiming to have seen Mr. Holt join a deputation in Manchester when he was actually at Windermere. Here we have a psychological phenomenon of the gravest interest. We all know that in hallucinations, when the patient is dominated by a fixed idea, the distinction between subjective and objective for the moment disappears. Dr. Henry Maudsley, the famous specialist on such topics, writes: "If a man has a foregone conclusion of what he will see, it is not safe to trust his observations implicitly, either in science or in common life. One efficient cause of hallucinations is a vividly conceived idea which is so intense that it appears to be an actual perception, *a mental image so vivid that it becomes a visual image.*" Dr. Maudsley also quotes the case of

William Blake, poet and painter, who said: "You have only to work up your imagination to the state of vision, and the thing is done."

Taking then the most charitable view of Mr. Lewis's mistake, let us regard it as a case of hallucination. We know that in *delirium tremens*, at one extreme, visions purely subjective possess to the individual experiencing them all the force of objective reality, and it now seems that at the opposite pole of teetotal obsession (*delirium fanaticum*, shall we call it) there is the same possibility of hallucination. What is established in this case is that Mr. Robert Lewis and another possess the power of seeing what is not there to be seen, for he states that his own clear conviction of seeing Mr. Holt pass from the well of the court was confirmed at the time by a magistrate present in court. The incident seems to have discredited Mr. Lewis with the general public more than with his friends, for at the Free Trade Hall meeting you made a kindly reference to his name (a reference which was received with applause by the audience), and on the first of November the *Manchester Guardian* allowed Mr. Lewis to appear as a moral monitor, exhorting all good citizens to rally to the side of righteousness. We all know how Manchester responded to that appeal. The public conscience was outraged by the light manner in which such serious charges were advanced, and the levity with which their refutation was treated. It was made abundantly evident that the moral code recognised by the public clashed with the moral code embodied in the agitation.

Although in your case the teetotal obsession is not, as in that of Mr. Lewis, strong enough to enable you to see with your bodily eyes what is not present, yet it is sufficiently powerful to enable you to see with the eyes of your mind what does not exist, and to distort beyond recognition the objects on which your mental vision operates. Let us take an instance. Mr. Holt, after many years of public service, was offered the Mayoralty some years ago, but declined it for family reasons. In 1907, when he had seventeen years of work to his credit, the offer was repeated, and this time was accepted, many having held

the office after a shorter period of service. These, then, were the facts—longer service and, as compared with others, tardier recognition. But when you came to view these facts they changed under your gaze into a dark conspiracy on the part of the trade to place their nominee in power. On this theory Mr. Holt's former refusal of the office was caused by the hostility of your friends to his claims, while his acceptance in 1907 meant that the City Council of 120 members was dominated by a little group connected with the licensing trade. Of this the only shred of evidence adduced was the wish expressed by the trade that any of their members otherwise eligible for public office should not shrink from accepting it. The deprecation of a trade disability was construed into the assertion of a trade tyranny. The picture you drew had no verisimilitude. As with your vision of the present, so, too, with your prevision of the future. Looking forward in November last, you foresaw all manner of evil as likely to occur after Mr. Holt's election. Vice was to flourish and drunkenness to increase, the City Council was to be dominated by the brewing interest, the Licensing Committee might be corrupted, the police could scarcely be trusted to do their duty impartially. All these dire predictions have been falsified by the event. So unsafe is it to rely on one's imagination for one's facts. Although your prejudices against brewers and publicans do not affect your bodily vision, as in the case of Mr. Lewis, yet, equally with him, you labour under an acquired inability to do those classes simple justice. The average Englishman has a passion for fair play, and he is troubled with an uneasy sense that you and your friends cannot always be trusted to give your opponents fair play. Hence partly the ill-success of your agitation.

In a speech which you made about the middle of last March you lamented the poor progress made by the cause you have at heart. I quote the *Manchester Guardian* report: "Speaking of the temperance agitation generally Canon Hicks said it had had to go on much longer than it ought without having had considerable assistance from Parliament. He pointed to the legislation following the

agitation against slavery and the Corn Laws. But the temperance agitation had had to go on, half century after half century and generation after generation had passed, and still substantially the conditions as regarded temperance in the streets and alleys, the towns and villages, remained largely unchanged." In commenting on this, I would make two remarks. In the first place, it must be remembered that there is an essential difference between your unsuccessful agitation and the two successful ones you named. They both aimed at removing restrictions, yours aims at imposing them. They enlarged the bounds of freedom, yours seeks to contract them. In the second place, the mode in which the agitation has been conducted has done much to render it ineffectual. On the eve of the Peckham election the *Daily News* wrote: "It is a fight in which all the decent elements of society are on one side, all the corrupting influences on the other." This utterance, so thoroughly characteristic of the paper and the cause, is a specimen of language which does much to alienate moderate opinion. It is easy and convenient to assume to your side all the good motives and impute to your opponents all the bad ones. It suits your case to hold the brewers and publicans of to-day responsible for the existence of their trade, and to lay upon their shoulders all blame for the excessive drinking which takes place. But in doing this you affront the public conscience, which requires that a class created by a public demand and ministering to a public want shall be treated with ordinary fairness. The fact that the same United Kingdom Alliance which in 1872 rejected with scorn a Licensing Bill with a time-limit of ten years is now fighting for one containing a time-limit of fourteen years suggests grave reflections. So far from making headway, the organisation has lost ground; a result which could scarcely have followed had its principles been sound and its methods unexceptionable. Every cause is to some extent in the hands of its advocates, who can do much to make or mar its fortunes. The failure of your local agitation against the election of Mr. Holt throws an illuminating light on the failure of the Alliance as a

national movement. In both cases the spirit displayed and the methods employed are such as to alienate that great mass of neutral opinion which must be won over to a cause before its triumph can be secured.

### OPEN LETTER TO

THE REV. J. SCOTT LIDGETT, M.A., PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE  
OF THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE.

Manchester was favoured last autumn with the intervention in her municipal affairs of the President and Vice-President of the Wesleyan Conference as well as of the *Methodist Recorder* and *Methodist Times*. All this unprecedented denominational effort was put forth in order to guide Manchester citizens from outside in the choice of a Lord Mayor. You interfered in a double capacity, both by speech as President-designate and in the columns of the paper you edit, the *Methodist Times*. No effort, so far as I know, was made by you or any other Wesleyan to save London from having a brewer Mayor. It seems strange that one brewer should be held good enough for the Metropolis, in which you reside, whilst another brewer is not considered by you good enough for a provincial city, in which you have no direct interest. Was it that any attempt to impose your will on London in that respect would have been laughed to scorn by Londoners? However that may be, it is noteworthy that Manchester rejected your advice last November in as marked a manner as London had done the previous March in the County Council election.

Your argument at the Central Hall on the Mayoralty question that an interest which has to be supervised is "not an interest to be placed in command of the machinery by which it is supervised," is irrelevant, for, in fact, as the Chairman of the Watch Committee stated, Mr. Holt could not influence that Committee if he would, and would not if he could. Your statement in the same speech that in the career of the Bishop of Manchester you "had never observed anything like statesmanlike wisdom" suggests unflattering reflections alike on your powers of observation and on your standard of courtesy

It would be interesting to have the opinion of the Bishop on your own "statesmanlike wisdom," but there is no likelihood of such a retort being forthcoming, for the controversial standard of Anglican bishops excludes such personal references.

Your own action on the London County Council has not given us a very exalted idea of your title either to guide the citizens of Manchester or to censure their Bishop. On that body you were one of the items in a political party which departed from the honourable tradition of the old School Board and excluded reporters from the deliberations of a committee whose work involved an expenditure of four millions of public money yearly. Although your party had promised justice to the teachers in denominational schools, they broke their pledge until the near approach of the election in March, 1907, induced a partial and unsatisfactory death-bed repentance. A little justice was to be meted out in instalments to that wronged class, lest the shock of being all at once put on an equality with their fellow-teachers of the provided schools should take away their breath. I have called this a death-bed repentance, but it would be more correct to style it post-mortem reparation, for the moribund Council remitted to its successor the correction of the injustice it had committed.

In order to secure the renewal of your party's misused power, you sought to employ the machinery of London Methodism towards that end, and when your friend of the Free Church Council, Mr. R. W. Perks, modified the point of your effort, you rounded on him with the polite remark that there was "a flavour of Satan rebuking sin" in his protest against introducing politics into Methodism. These words imply that you plead guilty to the charge of bringing politics into religion, but that by way of extenuation you plead that Mr. Perks himself is as bad or worse. Altogether two noteworthy admissions.

But these matters, important though they are, fade into insignificance in comparison with your treatment of the question of national education. Where in this subject have you displayed that "statesmanlike wisdom"

the possession of which you loftily deny to the Bishop of Manchester? I know what Wesleyan educational principles were forty years ago, for I learned them under the teaching of the Rev John Scott. But to what a tangle of difficulty and self-contradiction is it reduced to-day through the influence of the late Rev. H. P. Hughes and the alliance of yourself and other Wesleyans with the leaders of the Free Church Council. Mr. Perks declares in the House of Commons that Wesleyans desire not merely Bible teaching in all day schools, but also Bible instruction. For this he would make all contribute, including many who conscientiously object to such teaching. Yet at the same time he declares with the passive resisters that no one must be compelled to contribute towards religious teaching to which he conscientiously objects. He and you raise the cry, "No tests for teachers," yet you expect the teachers to give your Bible teaching in the schools. If the fact that they have to give this religious instruction reacts selectively on the teachers, tests are in actual operation, in which case what becomes of the cry? If they do not, your Bible teaching will be largely given by those who do not themselves believe what they teach. Moreover, the denominational colleges which have hitherto done so much to supply teachers suitable for this part of their work are to be deprived as far as possible of their denominational character, so that the proportion of teachers fully equipped for religious teaching must steadily decline. As to the character of the religious instruction recommended by the Free Church Council at their Newcastle meeting, it may be questioned whether it can justly be styled Christian, for in reply to the challenge of the Dean of Canterbury, Dr Clifford would not say that it included the central doctrine of Christianity—the deity of Christ.

You are well aware that many of your colleagues of the Free Church Council are in favour of secular education, and that the President declared that a vote against that "solution" of the question could not be carried in that body if a proposal in its favour were made by the Government. Your sense of the insecurity of religious education

in such hands has even led you to hint at the disruption of the Free Church Council as the possible result of its adoption of the secular policy. Referring to the declaration in favour of secular education made by the President, you said: "Nor could his view be adopted as its final policy without such a conflict as might endanger its very existence." What a position of affairs! Was it to bring the cause of religious education in the day schools into so precarious a position that the policy of John Scott and Dr. Rigg was reversed, and Methodism allied on its educational side with a party predominantly political?

At the Southport meeting of the Free Church Council Mr. McKenna's Education Bill was, according to the report, approved by a unanimous vote. The word unanimous scarcely applies. These same men, had the Government proposed what is called the secular solution, would have carried a vote in its favour, as Dr. Harris stated a year before. As it was, Mr. McKenna had proposed Cowper-Temple teaching, and all voted in its favour. It was not a matter of minds, but of hands. The vote was in the region of tactics rather than of principle. Many of those present were like-minded with Dr. Massie, who, a few weeks before, had stated candidly that he believed in secular education, but that, if the party advocated that view, "Mr. Balfour would sweep the country." Such men can give no guarantee of the permanence of Cowper-Temple teaching if it were established. It would come to the country from their hands rather than their hearts, and would find in them but half-hearted defenders should a new tribe of passive resisters subject it to attack.

The proposals of Mr. McKenna's Bill in reference to single-school areas were heartily endorsed by yourself and the Free Church Council. Let us suppose them carried into effect. How would the new arrangement appear to a villager who was outside the ranks alike of Church and Dissent? We will take the case of an agnostic who reads his *Clarion*, and holds with Mr. Blatchford that "Christianity is not true." Such a man might hold to his Nonconformist fellow-villagers language something like the following: "Taught by you, I become a passive

resister, and refuse to pay towards religious teaching to which I conscientiously object. When you resisted you did so on account of a little difference, for Church and Dissent are both forms of Christianity, whereas I reject Christianity altogether. And while the Churchman by providing a site and school building, and by subscription had something to set off against the religious teaching he favoured, you throw all the cost of your form of religious teaching on the public. And I further claim your sympathy because many of your most trusted leaders, although they helped to establish Bible teaching in the schools, had declared that they thought the secular solution the only just one." What would village Nonconformists say to such a plea? What could they say?

#### OPEN LETTER TO THE

REV. DR. JAS. HOPE MOULTON, OF DIDSBURY COLLEGE.

When, more than thirty years ago, I was a student in the Logic Class of the late Professor Jevons, we were cautioned against the mistake of drawing general conclusions from particular premises. You seemed to me to draw a conclusion wider than your premises when in a letter on the Mayoralty question you inferred that because you were personally conscious of being uninfluenced by religious or political partisanship in the matter, there was, therefore, no such element in the whole movement. Just as one swallow does not make a summer, so one individual does not comprise an entire party. In a phrase, the strength of whose language stood in marked contrast to the weakness of the argument, you "nailed this lie to the counter," yet the letter in which these amiable words occur was immediately followed in the columns of the *Manchester Guardian* by another containing a direct political appeal from a brother minister.

A somewhat similar objection lies to a remark you made in your speech at the protest meeting in the Free Trade Hall, when you said that the agitation against Mr. Holt's election was not a clerical movement, for the two speakers who had preceded you were laymen. The argument is too casual and incidental to have weight. A

movement dominated by clerics may enlist the support of some laymen without losing its essentially clerical character. One of the other speakers at the Free Trade Hall delivered himself of a remark which might take rank with the one of your own just quoted. He said that the opposition to Mr. Holt's election was not a Nonconformist movement, because Canon Hicks occupied the chair at that meeting. The presence of one clergyman does not balance that of hundreds of Nonconformists. A movement may be preponderatingly Nonconformist and yet include one or two Anglicans. No one would deny that passive resistance was in its broad character a Nonconformist movement, although one or two clergymen and a handful of Agnostics have been found in its ranks.

In a letter which you wrote on the education question you repudiated the statement that Wesleyan Methodism was a daughter Church to the Church of England, because, you said, that would make Methodism the grand-daughter of the Church of Rome, which, you declared, was absurd. Herein you obviously assumed that the Church of Rome stood in the relation of mother to the Church of England. Yet you declared yourself willing to admit that the English Church and Methodism were "sister" Churches. Now, sisters are daughters of a common mother, and you had implied that the Church of England was daughter to the Church of Rome, so that your statement binds you to the view that Methodism also is a daughter to the Church of Rome. After rejecting as absurd a view which, you said, implied that Methodism is the grand-daughter of the Church of Rome, you prefer a statement which implies a filial relation. If the idea of being a grand-daughter is unwelcome and absurd, the idea of being a daughter should be still more unwelcome and absurd.

I mention these points in no petty or carping spirit, but because the possession of great learning is a minor qualification for safe leadership of public opinion compared with the ability to draw correct conclusions from acquired knowledge without being influenced by bias, passion, or prejudice. Now that under the new order

of things Wesleyan ministers essay to guide the Wesleyan public and others to definite conclusions on the burning questions of the day, the competence of such guidance is a fair matter for criticism. Perhaps the most notable intervention of a London Wesleyan minister in Manchester affairs occurred when, in 1888, the late Rev. H. P. Hughes spoke in the Free Trade Hall in favour of the Unsectarian party at the School Board election. Although that party was pledged to preferential treatment of the Roman Catholics in the new Day Industrial School, he gave them support, making no reference whatever to that subject in the course of a long speech. The opinion of the Manchester public was made clear when in the following election the membership of the Unsectarian party on the School Board sank from six to four out of fifteen, the lowest in its history. In that way the citizens of Manchester responded to the suggestion of a London Wesleyan minister. In November, 1897, the people of Manchester pronounced opinion by their votes on another ministerial suggestion, this time from Didsbury, when Professor Slater stood as a candidate for the local School Board. My friend the late Mr. William Wardale told me that the Manchester Wesleyan Synod recommended Professor Slater to the support of the Wesleyan electors, but did not propose to countenance his own candidature, although as a Wesleyan candidate and a member of that Synod he had equal claims to recognition with the Didsbury professor. Perhaps it may be said by way of excuse that Mr. Wardale had the support of the teachers as a body. That is true, just as it is true, on the other hand, that Mr. Slater had his prestige as a minister and professor. But these professional questions were outside the scope of the Synod, which should have dealt with two equally well-qualified Wesleyan candidates on equal terms simply as Wesleyans. As it was, at the evening service of the Sunday immediately prior to the School Board election, Mr. Wardale had the mortification of seeing persons standing at the doors of the chapel he attended busily engaged in distributing handbills of which the text was that Wesleyans should vote for Mr. Slater. In

the result Mr. **Wardale** headed the poll with 84,259 votes. Professor Slater, with 25,367, was one of the rejected candidates, and the lowest but one out of the entire list.

Ten years later, in 1907, over the question of Mr. Holt's designation to the Mayoralty, came another lead from Didsbury, which also failed of acceptance by the general public. The movement in which you took so prominent a part was felt by many to be essentially of a persecuting nature, and as such was generally condemned. The people willed that so long as brewers existed to meet a public demand, they should not be denied the rights of citizenship in all their fulness. The undesirability of class disability seems to have been the lesson inculcated by the November polls of 1907.

You are now taking a very decided stand in favour of the Government's Licensing Bill. Just as some of us felt that you and your friends were prepared to mete out to a local member of the trade something a little less than justice over the Mayoralty question, so on this larger national matter of licensing we have an uncanny feeling that your party is scarcely fair to the interests involved. In your sermon of March 15th, in the Free Trade Hall, you said that the fact that the trade was so violent "proved conclusively" that the Licensing Bill would do much to abate the evils of drink. Such a remark throws light on your idea of conclusive proof. I will match your remark with another. A few months ago Dr. J. H. Moulton was advocating in the same Free Trade Hall a measure of injustice to a local brewer because he was a brewer. The fact that the same Dr. Moulton now supports the Government Licensing Bill "proves conclusively" that it, too, is a measure of injustice to the brewing class. This is at least as good a plea as your own. Of course, neither yours nor mine is a conclusive proof. Such arguments are of a merely presumptive character, and may range in value from a high to a low degree of probability.

So, too, with regard to your support of Mr. McKenna's Education Bill, does it not seem harsh treatment and savouring of persecution to take possession of Church

schools in single-school areas for five days in the week, bring all the parochial activities to an end on the evenings of those days, set up the Bible teaching desired by Nonconformists to be taught in school hours by the school teachers, while the religious teaching for which the school was built can only be given out of school hours in lessons which will certainly be extra, and may easily be regarded by the children as punishment lessons marking them off in an invidious way from their established and endowed Nonconformist school-fellows? In my opinion, the appeal to the national conscience on this matter made by the Bishop of Manchester is necessary and praiseworthy, as was also the stand he made on the Mayoralty question. I was sorry to see that with reference to the latter the Rev. Geo. Hooper said that "the Bishop's letter was just what might be expected from a bishop, sophistical and casuistical to the core." Criticism of this kind reflects the bias of the critic rather than a judgment in harmony with facts. Alike over the purely local question of the Mayoralty and the wider question of national education, the action of the Bishop of Manchester failed to please those who derived their inspiration from the Free Church Council, but the event will probably show in the latter case, as it did in the former, that it appealed with success to a larger public. In the meantime the somewhat savage tone in which certain Nonconformist ministers assail bishops in general, and the Bishop of Manchester in particular, reminds one of the suggestive slip made by the schoolgirl, who, in her essay on wild beasts, wrote, "There are now no wild beasts in England except those in Theological Gardens."

#### OPEN LETTER

To R. D. DARBISHIRE, ESQ.

(Honorary Freeman of the City of Manchester).

When the Manchester City Council bestowed upon you the merited honour of the freedom of the city, no one marred your legitimate satisfaction by any contemptuous reference to your calling; but when the same Council indicated its intention of conferring the equally merited

honour of the Mayoralty on Alderman Holt, you wrote a letter in which you not only impugned the wisdom of the Council, but also hurled at Mr. Holt's business the wounding phrase "this devil's trade." The insult conveyed in these words passes by the man for whom it was intended, and fastens on the nation that created and sanctioned the trade, maintains it in being, and does not disdain to draw some tens of millions of national revenue from this source.

Probably if votes were taken on the comparative popularity of lawyers and brewers, it is not your class that would head the poll. Certainly there are no phrases in current speech aimed at the brewer class to compare with those directed against lawyers. Sir W. H. Vaudrey, on his installation as Mayor, himself good-humouredly quoted one of these, saying that when a certain person was told to go to the devil he went to see his lawyer. On similar lines is the oft-quoted phrase describing a religious lawyer as one who was a professing Christian but a practising attorney. The general view of the phrase "An honest lawyer" as almost a contradiction in terms points also to a certain degree of floating unpopularity attaching to the lawyer class. Yet in spite of all this, in spite, too, of the fact that some solicitors have to be struck off the rolls—that the profession is to a certain extent associated with chicanery and crime—that however bad the case a lawyer can generally be got to take it up—we rightly hold the law to be an honourable profession, and should regard it as intolerable narrowness if a lawyer's business were called a devil's trade, and made a bar to the conferment of civic honours.

It was with great regret that many Manchester citizens saw you lend the weight of your justly-honoured name also to a movement so anarchic as the passive resistance crusade. A life spent with distinction in the practice of the law might, they felt, have been expected to inculcate a greater regard for law and constituted order, the very foundation of the State's stability. Hence it was with added pain they saw that you not only adopted so subversive a course, but did so with such an extremity

of assertion, offering to the distrainers the casket containing the record of your admission as honorary freeman of the city and taking the chair at a passive resistance demonstration in the Town Hall itself, thus converting the very focus of civic order into a centre for promoting resistance to that order. The protest of Nonconformity in the past was necessary and justifiable, but is it not possible in these modern days to insist too strongly and in too violent a manner on presumed rights to the disregard of correlative duties? We all have to live together in a community, and should not push our claims to consideration to the detriment of the equally valid claims of our fellow-citizens. The rights of one type of conscience are not absolute, but are qualified by the equal rights of other types. Not only is passive resistance bad citizenship, but even for passive resisters themselves it is bad policy. Men who rely on future legislation as a great instrument in securing those changes in the social order which they desire, should be the last to show how legislation may be reduced to impotence. The Nemesis of passive resistance is already apparent in the check upon new educational legislation imposed by the dread of passive resistance or worse on the part of those likely to be aggrieved thereby. I say "worse," because the coming race of resisters may be tempted to say to their predecessors in the words of Shylock, "The villainy you teach me I will execute, and it shall go hard, but I will better the instruction." *Facilis est descensus Averni.*

Last year, along with other members of the Teachers' Guild, I received from you by post a pamphlet condemning altogether corporal punishment in schools, and closing with the following sentence: "Oh, teachers, be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect."

The body of this pamphlet consisted merely of two cases of injudicious punishment, one by the head-master of a boarding school, the other by a school doctor. Ignoring the legal dictum that hard cases make bad law, ignoring, too, the common maxim that rules must not be based on exceptional instances, you rested your argument

on the tacit assumption that no power must be allowed which is susceptible of abuse. What authority would survive such a test?

When I began educational work in Manchester in 1865, teachers were allowed without question larger powers of discipline and greater freedom of initiative than is the case to-day. Those powers were used with judgment to the advantage of the children, and the ultimate benefit of the city at large. Since then Manchester education has come to be admirably organised, large sums of public money have been and are being expended upon it, an able and devoted Education Committee toils laboriously at the task of its control, yet the result is generally felt to be scarcely commensurate with the effort. There is a pervading sense of intellectual monotony and moral indiscipline. The symptoms are obvious, but what of the remedy? Nothing would help so much to bring about a more satisfactory state of things as a change of attitude to the teachers. Honour them, magnify their work, entrust them with larger powers of discipline, allow greater scope to individual initiative and resource, abate the multitudinous examinations, inspections, and reviews to which they are subjected, and reduce the clerical work of form-filling and return-making to a minimum. A policy of confidence and sympathy would soon be justified by its results.

#### OPEN LETTER TO

MR. J. W. GRAHAM, M.A., PRINCIPAL OF DALTON HALL.

To you belongs the double distinction, such as it is, of writing the bitterest of many bitter letters in the Mayoralty controversy and of making the most insulting allusion of all the speakers at the protest meeting held in the Free Trade Hall. The soil of piety and learning would, one might think, grow the fine flower of Christian courtesy. As Mr Belloc writes:—

“Of Courtesy it is much less  
Than Courage of Heart or Holiness;  
Yet in my walks it seems to me,  
The Grace of God is in Courtesy.”

Your reply to an appeal for courtesy in this connection would perhaps be that the loud cries of truth and justice sometimes drown the milder tones of courtesy. Let us take it on that ground. In every other sphere you hold a man responsible for his own acts, not for the deeds of another. The faults of the glutton are not placed on the shoulders of those who supplied him with food, the excesses of dress extravagance are not imputed to the shop-keeper who supplied the goods; only in one trade is the trader made responsible for the abuse of his products.

In your letter to the *Manchester Guardian* you drew a fancy picture of a philanthropic meeting in the Mayor's Parlour, with Mr. Holt. as Mayor, in the chair. Referring to the tea provided by the Mayor's hospitality, you said that "each cup tasted as though it represented the profit on the pint too much which some poor fool had taken," and you represent the speaker who is moving a vote of thanks to the Mayor as "stumbling upon a poor despairing witticism about his Worship's interests being invariably devoted to the public."

This picture does more credit to your powers as an imaginative writer than as a prophet, for even flights of imagination should be subject to the canons of self-consistency and good taste. The picture you drew of the scene in the Mayor's Parlour lacks verisimilitude, for those who could not drink the Mayor's tea without thinking censorious thoughts of their host would surely not drink it at all. As for the poor despairing witticism about his Worship's interests being invariably devoted to the public, the remark would not be uttered, because those who accept the Mayor's hospitality are presumably English gentlemen and ladies, and as such incapable of so gratuitous an impertinence.

After the written word came the spoken word well fitted to match it. In your speech at the Free Trade Hall you compared the money expended by Alderman Holt in philanthropic work with the thirty pieces of silver which the traitor Judas received for betraying the Christ. A few hours before hearing these words fall from your lips I had read an account in a newspaper of the shocking con-

ditions under which the raw cocoa largely purchased by Messrs. Cadbury and other Quaker firms was obtained, and I could not help wondering if in drinking a cup of the Cadbury cocoa you would apply the same method of reasoning. Would you condemn the philanthropies of the cocoa firms as the fruit of blood money? Would you say that the funds subscribed to the support of the Free Church Council were comparable to the thirty pieces of silver received by the betrayer? If Mr. Holt's tea brought up such unpleasant thoughts, Mr. Cadbury's cocoa would, I suppose, recall to your mind the bleaching skeletons of the negroes who lay down to die in their march from the interior of Angola to the coast—of “the innumerable offences against the person” which occur in the islands to which the hapless survivors of the march are conveyed—of anæmia and dysentery, diseases born of absolute hopelessness, carrying off their victims at the rate of one-fifth of their numbers yearly. To think that men who are eloquent on Chinese labour and Congo atrocities can be dumb about work like this. Let us, in the name of common justice, have either a smaller expenditure or a more equitable distribution of this abounding righteous indignation.

Just as you seem incapable of doing ordinary justice to Mr. Holt, so do you turn angrily upon the Bishop when he states the equities of the case. Woe to the man you dislike; woe, too, to him who stands for justice to the man you dislike! Not high station, not lofty character, not apostolic labours avail to save such an one from your unworthy and unjustifiable insinuations. “The Bishop may have been sent here by Mr. Balfour as a first-rate fighting man” contains a suggestion which, with its double edge against the Bishop and Mr. Balfour, must have been very gratifying for you to make, but the ninth commandment should have barred the utterance. You hint that Dr. Knox is in alliance with the drink trade—“We all like to keep with our intimates”—the very charge brought by the Pharisees of another day against the Christ, whom they accused of consorting with sinners.

You entirely misrepresented the Bishop's argument in

reference to Mr. Holt's diligence in his business. Dr. Knox wrote: "It is surely unjust to object to a man's diligence in promoting his work. Such diligence is rather a guarantee that he will discharge his public duties with equal diligence." Your travesty of this runs: "Whence comes an argument that a tradesman troubled by no scruples in pushing a dangerous trade shows himself likely for that reason to be a diligent occupant where grace, dignity, catholic sympathy, and personal weight are the chief qualities desired?" In this way do you pervert the plain argument that a man who discharges efficiently the duties of a necessary and legitimate trade is likely to discharge efficiently the duties of any post to which the goodwill and high appreciation of his fellow-citizens may call him. And after this exhibition of sophistry, you crown all by accusing the Bishop of being "sophistical."

The great fault of the Bishop's letter from your point of view, was that it was unanswerable. It was a calm appeal to reason against prejudice and clamorous abuse, a vindication of civic rights against those who sought to curtail them, an assertion of justice against the most reckless injustice, a repudiation, in short, of the new veto, the new inquisition, the new class persecution. Manchester emphatically endorsed the Bishop's judgment, and Alderman Holt as Lord Mayor is showing that he possesses those qualities of "dignity and personal weight" which you named as incompatible with his calling.

Much was said in the course of the recent controversy which will not bear comparison with the standard of the moral law. There is here ample scope for self-examination and heart-searching. Let us hope that time and reflection will bring you round to more balanced views and a kindlier spirit. For none of us, not even the most intense, has the reassurance of personal infallibility. We may, one and all, take to ourselves the remonstrance which Cromwell addressed to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1650, when he wrote from Musselburgh: "Is it infallibly agreeable to the Word of God, all that you say? I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible that you may be mistaken."

## OPEN LETTER

TO MR. E. VIPONT BROWN, M.D. (LOND.).

Elsewhere I have dealt with your statement that those should be considered unfit for positions of public trust "who take advantage in any way of their fellow-men." It is my wish in this letter to show how plausible a case might be made out for excluding members of your own profession from such positions. I present the effort, not as a genuine piece of reasoning, but as the "reductio ad absurdum" of your own.

Where, then, shall we begin our temporary and ungenial task of decrying the medical profession? Out of the abounding material at our disposal, let us select an Italian case in the fourteenth century in order to see what a great poet thought of doctors over five centuries ago. Petrarch, writing from Padua in May, 1371, to Pandolfo Malatesta, says: "All of a sudden a most violent fit of my familiar fever seized me. The physicians flocked in, some sent by order of the lord of the city, others drawn to the house by friendly concern for me. Up and down they wrangled and disputed, till at last they settled that I was to die at midnight. Already it was the first watch of the night; see what a tiny span of life remained to me, if these humbugging fellows' tales had been true! They said there was one possible expedient for prolonging my life a little—that of tying me up in some arrangement of strings so as to prevent me going to sleep. In this way there was just a chance that I might last till morning—a mighty tiresome price to pay for this little extra time! As a matter of fact, to rob me of my sleep was just the way to kill me. As I had always ordered my servants to do the exact contrary of what my doctors advised, I passed that night in a sweet, deep sleep, and I, that was to die at midnight, was found by my doctors when they flocked next morning to my funeral, sitting up and writing! They could say nothing but that I was a wonderful man. Yet, if I am a wonderful man, how much more wonderful are they!"

The case of Petrarch is historical. Let us turn now to a French skit which, though only a joke, is not without

a point fashioned by experience. The tale goes that a certain rich man who suffered from a troublesome disease was visited by a fairy, who handed him a magic ring, with the words, "It is not in my power directly to cure you, but I can do something to help you in the choice of a physician. Place this ring on one of your fingers, and when, armed with that, you approach the house of any professed healer, you will see before his door the ghosts of all those whom he has been the means of sending out of the world before their proper time." Losing no time in commencing his quest for a competent doctor, he took the ring, and sallied forth into the street. The first house he approached was that of the fashionable physician of the town, but before his door he saw such a crowd of ghosts clamouring for vengeance on the shortener of their lives, that he quickly passed on to the residence of a less fashionable doctor. Here the crowd was smaller, but still large enough to inspire anything but confidence. So on he went, full of doubt and misgiving, until at last he came to a house where the ghosts of only two victims were to be seen. "This man," he said to himself, "has only killed two of his patients, I will consult him." On entering he had the usual kind of interview with its formula of examination, diagnosis, prescription, fee, etc., and was about to withdraw when the doctor said to him: "Do not deem me impertinent, sir, but I am rather curious to know how you came to consult me. I am a comparative new-comer to the town, and so far have only had two patients."

But, leaving jokes on one side, let us return to facts. You, Dr. Brown, rightly deplore the evils of drunkenness, but will you tell us how much of the excessive drinking of to-day is due to the practice and recommendation of doctors in the past? How heavy, too, is the indictment against doctors on the score of preventible pain not cured through mistaken treatment or positively inflicted by barbarous treatment? Where, now, is the practice of cupping and bleeding? Gone to the limbo of exploded medical superstitions.

The anti-vaccinationist appears on the scene as a wit-

ness against the medical profession, and contends that it is wrong to put corruption into a child's system, and that if vaccination were really necessary a town like Leicester ought to have been decimated before now, seeing that for thirty years not one child in ten has been vaccinated there. In the large sums which the profession draws annually for vaccination fees the anti-vaccinationist sees a clash between the interests of a class and of the public at large. He holds, to use your own words, that in this case doctors "take advantage of their fellow-men."

The opponent of vivisection, too, has his quarrel with a section of the medical profession. The charge of inhumanity is freely brought against vivisectionists. Moreover, it was in order to provide cases for dissection that Burke, Hare, and others violated newly-made graves, and murders were even committed in order to provide doctors with "subjects."

Look at the hopeless division of opinion in medical practice and theory. We have the orthodox allopathic school, the homœopathic school, the hydropathic treatment, the herbalist, the "bone-setter," etc., and all equally helpless before such a disease as cancer. How little faith the general public have in medical treatment is evidenced by the hundreds of quack remedies to which they have recourse from Beecham's Pills "worth a guinea a box" (according to Beecham) downwards or upwards, I know not which.

There are three ways in which a doctor may view a patient:—

1. Purely as a fellow-creature, to be saved as much pain and to be cured as quickly as the doctor himself would wish if he were the patient. Let us call this the human interest.

2. He may consider his patient as a "case," and perhaps as a case for experiments, the effect of which he may watch and study for his professional improvement. We will call this the scientific interest.

3. There is the purely selfish and merely pecuniary interest, which tempts a man to prolong a case for the sake of increased fees, and suggests the abuse of that

power over his helpless patient which his professional position gives him.

Of the three interests just named only the first presents a case in which the professional view is in harmony with the public view. With regard to the other two, shall we assume (as you do in speaking of the publican's interest in the excessive sale of drink) that where the interests of the doctor and the public clash, those of the public are sacrificed? On this point a publican might very fairly say that he only serves his customers with what they demand, while a doctor imposes on a patient what medicine he pleases—that if he oversteps the line and serves a man in drink, the drunkard stumbles into the street advertising the fact to a critical public, while the doctor's deeds of a similar character are not done in the public eye, and, when a fatal case occurs, he has only to make out a burial certificate, and his failures are quickly put out of sight.

Of course, so long as human nature is what it is, some publicans and some doctors will succumb to the temptation to put their personal interests above those of the public weal, but in both cases it is unfair to condemn the class for the misdoings of a portion of that class. When, for example, I see in the *Birmingham Daily Post* of December 18th, 1907, that, when the vaccination fees were appointed to be reduced in Aston after a certain date the two public vaccinators, in order to secure as many cases as possible under the higher scale, began vaccinating children at an earlier age than usual, and even went so far as to vaccinate five children at the age of one day, am I justified in saying that all doctors act on the same principle? That is the way in which publicans are judged.

With regard to hospitals, I might quote the words of Dr J H. Keay, an ex-Guardian of the Greenwich Union, who said that even in a provincial hospital he had seen patients treated at the rate of one a minute, and that "the mischief wrought by the Poor Law sank into utter insignificance when compared with the mischief wrought by hospitals."

I will close my case with a quotation from the late Sir

Andrew Clark : "It is very hard for us doctors to think that we live by the sins, the ignorance, and the follies of mankind."

I have now presented a rough indictment of the medical profession on the lines which you followed in your attack on the brewer and publican. Does it follow from what has been adduced that doctors are to be decried as a class, held up to public execration, and refused positions of trust and honour? Nothing of the kind. I have simply matched your bad argument against the publican with my bad argument against the doctor, in order to discredit that class of reasoning. If this mischievous policy of class-hatred and class-branding were carried out, the community could not hold together for long. We should have a caste system worse than that of India, and what the end would be no man could say. Let us cease from bitterness and strife, and seek the co-operation of all classes for the public good. Where the spirit of Antipathy has failed, the genius of Sympathy may succeed.

#### COURT OF HONOUR.

\*Record of Trial before Mr. Justice Fairplay of T. BORER WILES on a charge of conduct unbecoming a citizen and a gentleman.

Counsel for the City of Manchester: Lawyer Good-enough.

Counsel for the prisoner: Lawyer Toogood.

At the commencement of the hearing the police proved eight previous committals to prison against the accused, who, they said, repeated his offence at regular intervals. The Prison Gate Mission and Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society produced no impression on the prisoner, who appeared to glory in the number of his offences.

Lawyer Toogood: I object, my lord, to the record of these committals being counted against the prisoner. They are part of the proceedings of the ordinary court.

Judge Fairplay: I disallow the objection. While it is true that this court deals with those finer social issues which concern the citizen, not as citizen merely, but as a man of honour, we cannot be indifferent to the prisoner's

record in the ordinary courts. The man who has broken the ordinary law has failed as a man, and may fairly be judged as likely to fail as a gentleman. We will proceed with the case. What is the offence for which he was committed to prison those eight times?

Police-sergeant: Refusing to pay his education rate, my lord.

Judge Fairplay: Such conduct was anarchic. He was playing the part of a bad citizen. If everybody acted like that, all law and order would go by the board.

Lawyer Toogood: It was a case of conscience, my lord. He wished people to argue like this—that the law he resisted must be a bad law because so good a man resisted it.

Judge Fairplay: That plea is not admissible here. Good citizens will rather say that a cause must be bad which relies on law-breaking for its support. When he gets the laws he favours passed how would he like them to be met with passive resistance?

L. T.: Before the evidence is produced I should like to make a preliminary objection. My client says that his name is not T. BORER WILES as printed on the charge sheet. He objects to insinuations, at least against himself, and says that the name contains no less than three injurious imputations which are calculated to prejudice his case.

J. F.: State them.

L. T.: He thinks that the letter T suggests that his staple drink is tea. This involves a sneer at his teetotal principles.

J. F.: The point is a trivial one. The prisoner is over sensitive.

L. G.: Those who deal most largely in insinuations are the first to resent them as against themselves, my lord.

L. T.: My client holds, in the second place, that the word BORER suggests that he bored or annoyed the public by the agitation which he commenced in Manchester. And, lastly, he considers that the name WILES insinuates that he employs wily, crafty methods in his propagandist work. The Bible, you will recollect, my lord, speaks of "the wiles of the devil," and that is an uncomfortable association for so conscientious a man as my client.

J. F. : Let the prisoner write what he deems his real name and pass it up to me. (This was done.)

J. F. : On comparing the names as written and printed I find that the first six letters in the printed form make, when re-arranged, the Christian name in the written form, and that, in like manner, the last five letters in the printed form make up when rearranged the surname in the written form.

L. T. : Can the name be altered to what my client has written?

J. F. : No, but if the prisoner wishes he may have his name as written added as an alias to the printed name. Persons who have been repeatedly imprisoned frequently accumulate aliases.

L. T. : My client is shocked at the idea of so good a man as himself being associated with an alias.

J. F. : He has associated himself with more questionable things. But go on.

Lawyer Goodenough then proved the following facts:—

1. That the prisoner had recklessly and wantonly disturbed the peace of the City of Manchester by commencing what he himself called “an embittered controversy” aimed at the choice of the City Council in the matter of the Mayoralty.
2. That he had put forward statements false to fact, and that in matters on which he professed to be an expert—as that Mr. Holt was President of the Brewers’ Association, that he was the largest owner of tied houses in Manchester, and so on.
3. That he displayed such culpable levity and carelessness in statements affecting the status of a leading citizen as to state that he had seen Mr. Holt present at a deputation in Manchester when he was at Windermere.
4. That he made an insinuation against Alderman Holt that he had authorised the offer of a bribe of £1,000 in order to buy off opposition to the granting of a certain licence, although Mr. Holt had then nothing to do with the plot of land in question.
5. That he displayed an incapacity to appreciate the

usual standard of men of honour, for when he had stated that both on the Licensing Bench and in the City Council there was the disposition to be considerate to an amiable colleague (thus suggesting a perversion of justice from reasons of favouritism), he maintained, when challenged on the subject by the Clerk to the Magistrates, that this charge implied "no serious imputation" on those concerned.

J. F.: Did the prisoner not make a full and frank apology when he found that his charges were false?

L. G.: No. In reference thereto he made the rather vulgar remark that "anything that stirred men up was helpful to them and to the civic forces. Therefore he never apologised for making a row. He might get his own hair pulled, but he could afford to be lost so long as the causes he advocated succeeded."

J. F.: He assumes that the end justifies the means.

L. G.: Yes, my lord, that is in accordance with the moral code of the agitation.

Lawyer Goodenough then addressed the court. He pointed out that the prisoner had sought to achieve his ends by methods repugnant to the mind and moral standard of an ordinary man of the world, to say nothing of the code of a man of honour. He showed that the prisoner was a pure obstructionist. As a Passive Resister he had sought to veto the will of the Imperial Parliament, as a leader in the Mayoralty agitation he set himself in opposition to the will of the constituted authorities of the city. He was, in fact, a compendium of prohibitions. Considered algebraically he was a minus quantity, considered logically he was a negative proposition, considered grammatically he was an adverb of negation, considered arithmetically he was an operation in division, considered musically he was a crotchet. The only redeeming feature in the case was that he had done more harm to himself than to the person he attacked. Like the dog in Goldsmith's poem, that "went mad and bit the man"—

"The man recovered of the bite,  
The dog it was that died."

Lawyer Toogood stated that whatever the prisoner had done had been done from the loftiest motives. He was a very good man, with an extra supply of conscience. Besides, he was backed by the best citizens of Manchester, ministers of religion, philanthropists, teetotalers, and what not.

J. F. : Do you mean to tell me that ministers of religion gave their moral support to this man's questionable methods?

L. T. : Well, my lord, they did give a general support, but are not to be held responsible for every detail of his advocacy.

L. G. : My lord, the gentlemen in question raised no objection to his methods until their unscrupulous character cast palpable discredit on their cause; and even then, at the Free Trade Hall meeting, a canon of the English Church made a reference to the prisoner's name and elicited some applause from those present.

J. F. : You amaze me. There is an obvious call for a revision of the moral code of the agitation, a rectification of moral standards that have become partially falsified.

The jury having unanimously pronounced the prisoner guilty of conduct unbecoming a citizen and a gentleman, the judge addressed the prisoner in the following words: "There was in your action over this matter an element of vindictiveness which does you discredit. Had you really believed the object of your attack guilty of bribery and other disqualifying acts you should not have waited for his designation to the Mayoralty before attacking him. The moment of attack was cruelly chosen, for a man capable of such acts is as unfit to be Councillor or Alderman as to be Mayor. The whole story of the 'thousand bright sovereigns' is a mere cock-and-bull tale viewed in itself quite apart from the crushing exposure to which it has been subjected. Where the man's utterance could be construed into a vague implication of Mr. Holt, you assumed that he was a credible witness, where what he said cleared that gentleman you assumed that he was not to be believed. You assumed that a Church of England clergyman was bribable in the matter, and that a sum so ridiculously

large would actually have been paid had the Rev. Mr. Wilson withdrawn his opposition to the licence. All this is childish folly which could only have imposed on those willing and anxious to believe the worst of one whose trade they disliked. When Mr. Holt proved that he was at Windermere on the day you said you saw him join the deputation of brewers in Manchester, you made a particularly shabby statement, in which you half hinted the truth of your original statement. Your words were 'My own clear conviction of seeing him pass from the well of the court to join the deputation in the Grand Jury box, confirmed, at the time, by a magistrate present in court, led me to make the statement.' That is not the way in which a gentleman repairs a personal wrong. You have throughout damaged your cause by your methods of advocacy. A Christian man, of all men, should keep his public support of a cause free from everything that fails in point of taste and character. After having acted so unlike a good citizen it required no small audacity for you to appeal on November 1st 'to all good citizens' to vote as you wished. In view of all the serious offences against the law of honour of which you have been proved guilty, the sentence of the court upon you is that you be sent to Coventry—that you be excluded from public controversy for seven years—that a Scroll of Civic Dishonour for the City of Manchester be drawn up, and that your name shall be the first to be inscribed thereon." His lordship concluded by recommending that a copy of this scroll should be made out on foolscap, should be enveloped in the copy of the *Manchester Guardian* containing the threat of "an embittered controversy" with which he commenced the late agitation, and in that form be presented to the prisoner by a big gun on his own side at a special meeting of the 'Citizens' Committee' to be summoned at the Central Hall for that purpose.



